97-84061-22

Huter, Jean Paul

What is true temperance?

Kansas City, Mo.

[1917]

97-8406/-22
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD



308
Z
Box 176

Huter, Jean Paul.

... What is true temperance? The temperance of Christ or the temperance of Mohammed? God in the war; by Jean Paul Huter. Kansas City, Mo., Reform publishing co. [1917]

cover-title, 48 p. 23½cm.

1. Temperance. 1. Title.

17-28979

Library of Congress HV5258.H8

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 4-1-97 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 23222

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Through the President's Office
5-29-24
308
Z
Box 176

What Every Thinking Man and Woman Should Read!

WHAT IS TRUE TEMPERANCE?

The Temperance of Christ or The Temperance of Mohammed?

GOD IN THE WAR

By Jean Paul Huter.

PRICE 25 CENTS

Published by REFORM PUBLISHING CO.
KANSAS CITY, MO.

Copyright, 1917 by
Reform Publishing Co.

THE BECK PRINTING CO.

I. WHAT IS TEMPERANCE?

How May We Obtain True Temperance?

All earnest and thinking men and women who have the betterment of social conditions at heart are deeply interested in Temperance. For temperance means self-control, conservation of energy, and the promotion of those strictly human and social values which, all in all, more than any other factor, make life worth living. Since temperance is such an important and valuable asset to the individual as well as to the community, and since we all must agree that to attain it to the highest possible degree is "a consummation devoutly to be wished," it behooves us, first of all, to inquire **what constitutes true temperance,** lest by misunderstanding its true nature we make our very zeal a stumbling block and render it very difficult, if not impossible, to attain the object of our earnest desires and endeavors.

No one will deny that intemperance is a very great evil and causes much human misery; no one will deny that many places where alcoholic liquor is dispensed without proper regulation and supervision and with disregard of special local conditions are often breeding places of vice and should be exterminated. But since it is beyond all doubt advisable not only, but absolutely imperative, that such places be suppressed forthwith, the further question seems readily to arise as to whether it were not best to suppress the sale of liquor altogether and render it not only difficult, but practically impossible, for anyone to obtain alcoholic beverages even of the milder types. A good many people have taken the position that the total removal of all opportunity to obtain liquor will effectually rid us of the evils pertaining to its sale and use, but since we are above all things anxious to bring about, as much as possible, a condition of true temperance, it is important that we find and employ the right method, the method which will most successfully insure such a condition. It remains, therefore, to be seen, before we go too far, whether prohibition can really be accepted as the right method. If the absolute suppression of certain highly objectionable phases of the sale of liquor is a matter in which we must all heartily agree, does it necessarily follow that the total prohibition of the sale and use of liquor is not only an effective remedy for all the evils incidental to such sale and use, but a remedy which, more than any other, will bring about that most desirable condition—real temperance in all things? If prohibition is such a specific remedy, let us by all means adopt it; but if prohibition has not been, and cannot be, proved such a specific and universal remedy, it remains to be seen whether absolute and indiscriminate prohibition may not become the cause of equally great, if not greater, evils than the evils for which it is supposed to be the cure. If it were merely a question of "rather bear the ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of," we could still embrace unconditional prohibition as a possible salvation from a social evil, for the honest and sincere reformer will certainly not hesitate to suppress a condition which seems responsible for existing evils, even at the risk of causing thereby other, but as yet wholly unknown, evils. But if the evils that follow in the wake of prohibition were found to be not an unknown quantity, but definite and tangible, destructive and disintegrating elements, we should indeed carefully weigh whether the evils thus engendered, directly or indirectly, by prohibition may not overbalance the evils which it is supposed to cure, and whether the cause of true temperance is really served and

INTENTIONAL SECOND EXPOSURE

Copyright, 1917 by
Reform Publishing Co.

THE BECK PRINTING CO.

I. WHAT IS TEMPERANCE?

How May We Obtain True Temperance?

All earnest and thinking men and women who have the betterment of social conditions at heart are deeply interested in Temperance. For temperance means self-control, conservation of energy, and the promotion of those strictly human and social values which, all in all, more than any other factor, make life worth living. Since temperance is such an important and valuable asset to the individual as well as to the community, and since we all must agree that to attain it to the highest possible degree is "a consummation devoutly to be wished," it behooves us, first of all, to inquire **what constitutes true temperance,** lest by misunderstanding its true nature we make our very zeal a stumbling block and render it very difficult, if not impossible, to attain the object of our earnest desires and endeavors.

No one will deny that intemperance is a very great evil and causes much human misery; no one will deny that many places where alcoholic liquor is dispensed without proper regulation and supervision and with disregard of special local conditions are often breeding places of vice and should be exterminated. But since it is beyond all doubt advisable not only, but absolutely imperative, that such places be suppressed forthwith, the further question seems readily to arise as to whether it were not best to suppress the sale of liquor altogether and render it not only difficult, but practically impossible, for anyone to obtain alcoholic beverages even of the milder types. A good many people have taken the position that the total removal of all opportunity to obtain liquor will effectually rid us of the evils pertaining to its sale and use, but since we are above all things anxious to bring about, as much as possible, a condition of true temperance, it is important that we find and employ the right method, the method which will most successfully insure such a condition. It remains, therefore, to be seen, before we go too far, whether prohibition can really be accepted as the right method. If the absolute suppression of certain highly objectionable phases of the sale of liquor is a matter in which we must all heartily agree, does it necessarily follow that the total prohibition of the sale and use of liquor is not only an effective remedy for all the evils incidental to such sale and use, but a remedy which, more than any other, will bring about that most desirable condition—real temperance in all things? If prohibition is such a specific remedy, let us by all means adopt it; but if prohibition has not been, and cannot be, proved such a specific and universal remedy, it remains to be seen whether absolute and indiscriminate prohibition may not become the cause of equally great, if not greater, evils than the evils for which it is supposed to be the cure. If it were merely a question of "rather bear the ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of," we could still embrace unconditional prohibition as a possible salvation from a social evil, for the honest and sincere reformer will certainly not hesitate to suppress a condition which seems responsible for existing evils, even at the risk of causing thereby other, but as yet wholly unknown, evils. But if the evils that follow in the wake of prohibition were found to be not an unknown quantity, but definite and tangible, destructive and disintegrating elements, we should indeed carefully weigh whether the evils thus engendered, directly or indirectly, by prohibition may not overbalance the evils which it is supposed to cure, and whether the cause of true temperance is really served and

promoted by prohibition. For what we all want is temperance, true temperance, not only in eating and drinking, but as much as possible in all human enjoyments, activities and relations.

The most important element entering into a discussion of the drink problem is its moral-religious aspect, but, before going more fully into a discussion of that part of the problem, we will contemplate it for a moment in the crucible of philosophic thought. As the ancient Hebrews treated all vital problems in the light of religious significance and moral application, so the Greeks, the intellectual leaders of classic antiquity, investigated all such problems in the light of reason and philosophy. Hence the Greek conception of temperance may at least serve as a guiding torch in such a discussion. The ancient Greeks reduced all virtue to four fundamental categories: COURAGE, TEMPERANCE, JUSTICE AND WISDOM. Our present purpose and space does not permit us to consider three of these fundamental aspects of virtue, our subject being Temperance. We may only allude to Courage as being the dynamic basis without which virtue cannot become active, and to Wisdom, as being the light that guides, while it is only through Justice that the exercise of virtue is practically realized according to the Greek conception. Justice, indeed, was deemed so important by Plato, the greatest thinker of antiquity, that he made it the subject of his most celebrated book, the Republic. The Greek conception of justice and the parallel conception of the spiritually more exalted Hebrews blossoms out into the **Christian Idea of Love**, the one and universal principle of the spiritual life.

But justice and love are universal and give not measure unto themselves. Yet everything that takes place according to time, place and circumstance must be done with **measure**, otherwise even justice and love would fail to accomplish their object, since excess at one time and in one place might evidently cause want at other times and places, and you might find yourself compelled to rob Peter in order to give to Paul. The law of giving, taking and doing according to right measure is the Law of Temperance, the great instrument of Justice and Love.

Temperance the Law of Laws.

Temperance has been called by a great poet the **Ruling Master**, and indeed in the strict sense of a law in its widest natural and sociological application, it is THE LAW OF LAWS. It prevails throughout nature, being called, in the highest generalization, the law of equal action and reaction; it has always been instinctively applied in the arts as the law of right proportion; in our modern ethical system it tends to identify itself with justice, while in that simple and childlike ethics which is as old and imperishable as the hills, it is simply the Golden Rule: **Do unto others as ye would that they do unto you.** However, it is chiefly in the relation to our personal conduct, whether with regard to the indulgence of our wants and desires or our behavior towards others, as far as not regulated by civic law, that this great and universal law and ruling master is at present called by its right name—Temperance.

Temperance a Quality of the Soul. Prohibition an External Condition.

At this point it seems proper to inquire as to what constitutes the difference as well as the kinship between temperance and prohibition, as applied to present day conditions in our own communities. Prohibition, as the word implies, is purely negative in its meaning and application, while temperance, as we have seen, is the principle of right measure in

all things. Temperance means voluntary restriction as well as rational tolerance in all things that are in themselves good or harmless or in which the good outweighs the evil. Temperance is altogether a quality of the character, while prohibition is merely an external, more or less arbitrary condition intended to produce the superficial results of temperance **by means of external force.** Temperance is part of the spontaneous inner life of man; prohibition forces, or attempts to force, external abstinence upon men.

The tone of the Jewish-Christian decalogue, as far as it applies to the conduct toward our fellowmen and to the indulgence of our desires, is almost exclusively negative or prohibitive, for it concerns itself chiefly with our tendencies to sin, the positively good instincts being presumed as having room to display themselves spontaneously within these restrictions. But although the secondary laws and regulations of Moses have much to say about eating and drinking, the decalogue has not a word as to what "Thou shalt drink or not drink," for the simple reason that drinking and eating in itself can never be criminal or sinful, and the law of God need not directly concern itself with these things, they being entrusted safely to nature. The "Thou shalt nots" of the Decalogue are therefore directed only against the unnatural and sinful methods of satisfying natural wants and needs; they do not aim at the suppression of those natural wants and desires or at the condemnation of their satisfaction by other methods; on the contrary, the legitimacy of those desires and their proper satisfaction is taken for granted. Thus the commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness," does not imply that a man may not refuse to disclose the truth in order to protect himself. The commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," does not mean that a man may not defend himself against attack or that the death penalty may not be imposed for murder and other equally grave crimes. (Remember that the same Moses who received this commandment from God soon thereafter bade the sons of Levi to "kill every man his brother and his companion," because they had fallen out of the true faith; and there were killed three thousand men.) The commandment that stamps adultery as a great sin and crime does not insinuate that the affection between the sexes is in itself sinful or that marriage is a thing to be avoided.

How different is the application of the law of temperance in a prohibitive form as embodied in such laws as forbid even the use of fermented beverages and make their sale a crime! Here prohibition is not merely a restriction, but an absolute inhibition of the satisfaction of a natural want. Not excessive indulgence but even the moderate use of such beverages is thus branded as a crime, and human nature is degraded by the assumption that (moral) evil is put into a man's soul by what he eats and drinks, and that he himself is wholly without moral autonomy and responsibility.

Since the terms prohibition and temperance are absolutely distinct and can never be used interchangeably, the word temperance, as currently used by our prohibitionists, being a distortion and misapplication of the true meaning of the word, it might be asked, what, in the widest and most abstract sense can be accepted as the **Measure of Life** and all its currents and manifestations? Protagoras, the Greek philosopher, declared MAN AS THE MEASURE OF ALL THINGS, a theorem which found ready acceptance among the people and which indeed, as a general attitude toward life, is the finest and grandest interpretation of the law of temperance. But as the concept **man** may have different meanings with different individualities and peoples, the great principle of Protagoras soon

led men, through the vice of self-conceit, to the transgression of all limitation and measure, to irreverance and self-magnification, which culminated in that most arrogant intellectual pride that was one of the active factors in the degeneration of ancient Greek civilization.

The Ideal or Divine Man the "Measure" and Law of Temperance.

MAN IS THE MEASURE OF ALL THINGS nevertheless, the Ideal or Divine Man who lives in the breast of everyone with infinitely varying intensity and vitality. Protagoras was not able to present to his contemporaries, either in nature or in art, the embodiment of such an ideal man, since he, as well as his whole nation, lacked the spiritual exaltation required to the conception and comprehension of such an ideal. But we, of these latter days, are in a more fortunate position, for we have before us, historically revealed, the ideal man, in Christ Jesus, in a far more perfect form than the Greeks were able to conceive of. For the principle of Protagoras, "MAN IS THE MEASURE OF ALL THINGS," we can now substitute, "CHRIST IS THE MEASURE OF ALL THINGS PERTAINING TO HUMAN LIFE," and thus attain the highest and most effective expression of the Law of Temperance.

"Christ is the Measure of All Things." Applied to present day conditions in our country, notably to the growing tendency to declare the use and sale of beer, wine and other liquors, not only a transgression of the Law of Temperance, but a crime even, we find that while St. John, the forerunner and herald of Christ, lived in the desert, abstaining not only from wine, but from all rich food (unless we look upon wild honey as a rich food), the Master used wine on every occasion that presented itself. But in the days of St. John, the Baptist, it may have been proper to fast for awhile, for the Light, the Bridegroom, had not yet arrived, even as at times, as the present almost are, when true enlightenment, mutual forbearance and the spirit of human kinship have sunk to a low level, the spirit of prohibition is abroad, throwing its gloomy and oppressive shadow over the hearts of men. But when the Master arrives and proclaims the true spirit of love and the ethical application of the Law of Temperance, it is time to be joyous and open-hearted, to be innocently and openly glad with one another as children of One Father. Even so wherever and whenever hearts are tempered by truth and enlightenment, it happens that whatever a man likes to take into his body should only add its mite to his well-being. For nothing is truer than this that whatsoever increases a man's content and cheerfulness works for a better humanity, a higher civilization, nay, **for the Kingdom of God.** True Temperance makes men sober at heart, prohibition alone can only make them act as if they were so. Only the weakest and wickedest hearts need guidance and external restraint in all things; but because some men will be drunkards shall all men be treated as possible and probable drunkards? Let it be remembered also that John the Baptist did not impose his ascetic manner of living upon others, nor did he presume to declare that because of his asceticism he was better than other people who lived normally. Wisdom becomes ever justified of her children, and the children of the world of the present day seem thus to have more of the true divine life than those who would without further ado stamp them as slaves and criminals.

II.

THE ATTITUDE OF CHRIST TOWARDS DRINKING.
St. Paul and Other Great Men.

The Christian religion was from the very beginning acclaimed as the motive power behind the prohibition movement, and from the very beginning of this movement to the present day the zealous people who believe in prohibition under all circumstances have been shouting from the house tops that they were working for, and in the name of, the Christian religion. With such constancy and vigor have they flourished the Christian religion as their banner in their propaganda that today the weaker and more purely mechanical members of Christian churches consider an abstainer as practically identical with a Christian, and a non-abstainer as practically the same as a non-Christian! But the cornerstone, the very life and soul, of the Christian religion is Jesus Christ. Hence the surpassing importance of Christ's attitude towards the use of wine, that is, alcoholic beverages as such.

The New Testament, which is, as it were, the constitution of the Christian church (if the New Testament can be at all compared to a legal document), and the Book of Books, establishes beyond controversy that of all great and notable men the greatest and most notable of them all, Jesus Christ, has paid the highest tribute to the fruit of the vine, **even the fermented fruit of the vine.**

Christ Provides Wine in Large Quantities as Something Better Than Water.

In the very first miracle (remember, the very first that is recorded) that he was called on to perform, at the wedding of Canaan, Christ transformed six large pitchers or pots of water into wine. (St. John ii:1-10.) He did this not at the beginning of the feast, when no one has as yet drunk any wine, but at the end of it, **when all the wine that had been provided for, probably as the occasion required, in generous quantities, had been drunk up.** What striking contrast does not Christ's conduct offer to that of a modern prohibitionist! It is noteworthy that Christ was not, on that occasion of heart-opening joyousness, **called on to replenish bread, or meat, or milk, or honey, or figs, or cake, but wine, only wine,** the fermented fruit of the vine, and that he did this gladly and without hesitation. The amount furnished by him was very large. The Bible states that each "pot" contained between two or three firkins. A firkin being about equal to nine gallons, the total quantity of wine furnished by Christ on that occasion was **between 432 and 648 quarts, or between 4320 and 6480 ordinary modern wine glasses,** a quantity which was enough to provide every adult citizen of Canaan with several glasses, if we suppose Canaan to have been a town of as many as 5,000 inhabitants and every citizen as being present at the feast. But it is unreasonable to suppose, in view of the small buildings used in that country at the time, that more than a few hundred guests, at the most, were present at the wedding, so that, by figuring the number of guests to have been about three hundred, there were **at least ten glasses for each guest in the amount furnished by Christ,** a quantity which would be considered rather excessive at a modern banquet. The Bible does not state how much was drunk previously, but it may be inferred that the quantity was considerable from the fact that the "governor of the feast" commented on the fine quality of the wine furnished by Jesus, while he failed to intimate that the quantity deserved any particular commendation.

In St. John, Chapter XV, Christ is recorded as paying one of the most

eloquent literal tributes to the wine-producing vine in that beautiful passage which begins: "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit," etc. This simile is not only eloquent in its simplicity and directness, but also potent with implied meaning, in so much as in the country in which Jesus lived the grape-vine was valued mostly on account of the wine, the fermented fruit of the vine, which was produced from it.

Christ, Drinking Wine, Scathingly Denounces the Abstemious Pharisees.

The opponents and enemies of Christ—Pharisees, priests and scribes—often referred to him as a **wine-bibber**, thus condemning what, in comparison with their own more abstemious lives, seemed intemperance to them. The Pharisees, we must remember, were noted for their exemplary lives; they conducted themselves with the strictest adherence to the laws and regulations of Moses; they were pointed out as patterns of law-abiding citizens in the theocratic government which was still assumed to hover over Palestine. Notwithstanding which passion for all that was lawful and according to law, notwithstanding their apparent ethical purity, they were hostile to Christ, and he retaliated by assailing them bitterly on many occasions, calling those "vipers" and "whited sepulchers" who were the exponents of formal and legalistic virtue, in word as well as in act. Christ was the "wine-bibber" and "glutton," but they were model citizens, **the prohibitionists of their day!** Should not this fact make anyone think twice before he decides that prohibition is the right method to bring about true temperance? It is needless to say that in reality it was Christ who was absolutely temperate, and that it was the Pharisees, the prohibitionists of their day, who were intemperate in feeling and thought, intolerant in their attitude, hardened and bleached to death by their spiritual pride.

Christ Honors Wine Above All Other Drinks, Using It as a Symbol of the Higher Baptism.

If Christ honored the fruit of the vine in his first public act, he bestowed even greater distinction upon it in the last social meeting he had with those nearest to him. In the Last Supper, the farewell gathering with his disciples, he compared the fermented juice of the vine to his own flesh and blood which was shed for the remission of sins (Matth. xxvi: 26, 29):

"And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Indeed, there is nothing more fittingly comparable to the blood of pure, unselfish love than the juice of the fruit of the vine **after it has become cleared and purified, by fermentation,** of its grosser elements, changed its murky and muddy color to a beautiful transparency, and exchanged an unenduring transient state for a quality which lasts practically forever and grows still slowly finer and finer as the years go by. Wine is the drink for those who are sound of body and pure in mind; it is a drink for the grown and mature, a drink for **men** specially prepared and administered, it is also good for many who are physically impaired, but it is certainly not good for physical weaklings and moral sicklings. How beautiful and full of significance is Christ's admonition on this occasion: "Do this to my memory!" I think I have sufficient spiritual insight to understand that Christ did not mean to attach special importance to the wine as such; it was merely the means which he used for his purpose, the symbol through which he expressed his thought; the thought, namely, that one idea, one purpose, one life should animate them all hereafter, as though the same and identical blood

were flowing through their veins and pulsing through their hearts, and that this blood was his **own blood,** t. i., his own life. But would he have employed anything to illustrate his great purpose and thought which was not in itself good and proper? Would he not have used something which was not only expressive of the symbol to be conveyed, but also in itself pure and without reproach? Or do you believe that he had adopted the famous (or infamous) maxim, that the end always sanctifies the means? Christ is a master in using symbols from nature for illustrating his thought and giving it immediate and forcible expression. Thus he speaks of "the lilies of the field" when he renders his opinion, incidentally, as to what constitutes a simple and beautiful dress; he refers to the "birds in the heaven" when he wishes to describe a happy and joyous existence; he describes his own affection for the children of Jerusalem by comparing it to a "hen spreading out her wings over her chicks." Besides, in the case of the last supper, he not only employs the wine as a beautiful symbol, but, incidentally, he drinks it, which act, according to the notions of our over-zealous prohibitionists, in itself would constitute a sin. It may be added that Christ on this occasion, as on others, did not merely sip or taste wine, but that he took a full, manly drink. Furthermore, he asks his disciples to continue to do this thing. To be sure, as I already explained, he primarily and fundamentally asks them **to live his own life,** yet incidentally and by direct implication he also asks them to be humanly and fraternally sociable by whatsoever means they might accomplish that end, eating bread and drinking wine being one of the legitimate means that might be thus employed, for that was the means used by himself personally. He certainly would not have asked them, either by injunction or example, either expressly or by implication, to use any means which could have harmed them or any children or men physically or morally.

Christ Made Wine, as a Rule, Says Lyman Abbott.

Christ's attitude toward the spirit of prohibition is succinctly summed up by Lyman Abbott, the well-known preacher and thinker:

"It was not the method of Jesus. **He lived in an age of total abstinence societies, and did not join them.** He emphasized the distinction between his methods and those of John the Baptist; that John came neither eating nor drinking, the Son of Man came eating and drinking. He condemned drunkenness, but **never in a single instance lifted up his voice in condemnation of drinking.** On the contrary, he commenced his public ministry by making, **as a rule,** wine in considerable quantity, and of fine quality, and this apparently only to add to the joyous festivities of a wedding."

Many will be surprised to hear Dr. Abbott's interpretation that Christ **made wine, as a rule,** but this interpretation is undoubtedly the right one, as is evidenced by the request addressed to him by his mother at the wedding of Canaan: "They have no wine," thus obviously taking for granted that it was **his** function, if not his habit, to supply wine at festivals.

We feel, therefore, justified in insisting that **no man has ever more fully, more emphatically and more beautifully sanctioned the use of wine as a drink than Jesus Christ, the founder and cornerstone of that religion in whose name the prohibition propaganda has been primarily waged to this day.** This fact is so simply, so plainly, so forcibly and so unequivocally revealed in the Gospel that no one in whose mind the **child** is not entirely extinguished can fail to notice it at a glance. If anyone can disprove this assertion, we shall be very glad to hear from him, but the proof must be drawn from the words and life of Christ, and from nothing else, least of all, from the pronouncements of anyone who cannot see that prohibition and temperance do not necessarily go together.

"Touch Not, Handle Not, Taste Not," a Maxim for Slaves, Says St. Paul.

If we now proceed from the attitude taken by Christ concerning the use of wine to that of his apostles, we find that **all of them drank wine.** We find, further, that the wisest and philosophically profoundest among these apostles, St. Paul, the great expositor of Christ's life and teachings, makes, in Colossians ii:20-23, a most significant utterance, part of which consists of the famous words: "Touch not, taste not, handle not." No passage in the Bible has been so much exploited by the prohibitionists and other over-zealous partisans as this; no passage has been so brazenly and persistently abused. For the prohibitionist and the perfervid total abstainer (the kind of abstainer who will forcibly impose his abstaining upon others) have again and again quoted this passage from the Bible as a most emphatic injunction against the use of wine or liquor in any form, and even in the smallest quantities. As a matter of fact, this passage implies as nearly as possible the exact opposite of the meaning forced into it by the propagandists who have cited it so freely, and, shall we say, so ignorantly or hypocritically. St. Paul, namely, severely rebukes in this passage those who exaggerate the importance of the incidental regulations of life, and who are puffed up with the careful observance of them, thus forgetting the fundamental issue, "the Head," while straining at gnats and chasing vain shadows. He says:

"Wherefore, if you be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (touch not, taste not, handle not; which all are to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines of men, which things have indeed a show in will-worship, and humility and neglecting of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh."

St. Paul could not possibly make it plainer that the "Touch not, taste not, handle not" people have not the right idea of the spirit of Christianity; that, in fact, they are doing their best to make the sacrifice of Christ of no avail, and substitute therefor rules and laws and ordinances of their own; that they please themselves by restraining their will and power to act, rather than to give that will an opportunity to unfold itself according to the example set by Christ; that, indeed, by these petty regulations they are endeavoring to work out their own salvation in accordance with their own notions, thereby making themselves spiritually conceited and "puffed up"; in fine, St. Paul makes it plain that the ordinance "touch not, taste not, handle not" is a law for slaves, not for Christians—slaves who prefer their own self-made fetters to the freedom and life of Christ.

St. Paul also makes it plain on other occasions that, in his opinion, those are led astray who make the matter of eating and drinking a subject of primary importance in endeavoring to realize the true life as given by Christ. Here we must bear in mind that in the time of Christ and St. Paul intemperance in eating was stigmatized as much as intemperance in drinking or any other intemperance of a similar kind. Thus we find in Romans xiv: "For one believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth; for **God hath received him.** He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and he giveth God thanks."

In other words, whether a man drink or eat, or whatever he drink or eat, does not make any difference in his favor before God. Whether he eat or drink, or not, let him do it or not do it with the right heart and the right motive, and his moral worth as such will be unaltered. Only if

a man either eat or drink with offense may he be adjudged guilty, St. Paul declares in the same chapter, 20-21. It is in the same spirit that Mary, the mother of our Lord, said to the servants at the wedding in Canaan, where Christ turned water into wine: "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it." For it signifies absolutely nothing whether a man drink or not; all that signifies is that he do God's will in doing everything to His honor.

What a vast difference between the attitude taken by Christ and St. Paul, on the one hand, and the modern Pharisees, our good prohibitionists, on the other!

The attitude of modern religious leaders and reformers on this question was likewise rational and sensible. Luther's appreciation of "good cheer" is well known; the austere John Calvin partook daily of wine, while John Wesley, the father of Methodism, and who is more particularly supposed to be the chief progenitor of the modern prohibition movement, expressly says that "Christianity does not require" abstention from wine. Wesley also refers to wine as "one of the noblest cordials of nature." (Tyerman's Life of Wesley.)

And if we should ask the opinion of men of genius with regard to the drink question, we can conclude this chapter by quoting from the "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table": "Sir, I repudiate the vulgarism (of calling all alcoholic beverages rum) as an insult to the first miracle wrought by the Founder of our religion. (And, therefore, let us add, an insult to the Founder himself.) I believe in temperance, nay, almost in abstinence, for healthy people. I trust I practice both. But let me tell there are companies of men of genius into which I sometimes go, where the atmosphere of intellect and sentiment is so much more stimulating than alcohol, that if I thought fit to take wine it would be to keep me sober. Among the gentlemen I have known few, if any, were ruined by drinking. My few drunken acquaintances were generally ruined before they became drunkards. * * * Men get intoxicated with music, with poetry, with religious excitement, oftenest with love."

III.

MOHAMMED FORBIDS THE USE OF WINE. IN CONTRADISTINCTION TO CHRIST, HE IS THE GREATEST PROHIBITIONIST IN HISTORY.

Having seen that the founder as well as the chief exponents of the world's greatest religion in ancient and modern times take an extremely liberal attitude toward the matter or drinking, we will turn our attention to certain nations who derive their moral precepts and the rules for their conduct of life from a religious creed which was founded and established only a few centuries after the birth of the Christian religion and in a country which is practically contiguous to Palestine, and in which nearly the same natural conditions with regard to climate, etc., prevail. This circumstance must be borne in mind, because it may be averred that at the time of Christ the ill effects of the intemperate use of wine were not so apparent as they are now, and that for this reason Christ's attitude regarding the drinking of wine was so liberal that he himself freely indulged on occasions.

Mohammed, the founder of the religious creed which is named after him and which at the present day counts more than two hundred millions of adherents, expressly and specifically forbids the use of alcoholic drinks, especially wine. This prohibition is considered an essential part of their religion by all Moslems in all parts of the world, so that the believer who uses wine commits a serious sin.

Now why did Mohammed, living only a few centuries after Christ, in

a country adjacent to the one in which Christ lived and acted in the body, forbid the use of wine to his followers, while this indulgence was not only permitted, but even approved by Christ? THE PRINCIPAL REASON IS THE GREAT MORAL SUPERIORITY OF CHRIST OVER MOHAMMED. This can be said without any qualification and without throwing any improper reflection on Mohammed who was himself one of the world's greatest and most remarkable men. In comparison with Christ's, Mohammed's vision was dim; he could not free himself from the notion that petty rules and regulations are an essential part of all true religions. He had found these petty rules in nearly all other religions that he had examined and he concluded that he must also make a liberal use of them, being, unlike Christ, utterly unable to transcend them. To Mohammed the life of the believer was something that was largely shaped for him by conditions and rules. He also emphasized the element of predestinations, thus making it appear that what was not determined by outward conditions was certainly due to internal or supernatural conditions. Christ, on the other hand, makes his disciples as **one** with the **Eternal Life,** veritable sons of the Universal Father. Furthermore, the people who were to be Mohammed's followers were not a settled nation like the Hebrews, but consisted more largely of nomadic tribes, warlike Arabs who had not the moral training of the Israelites. Nomadic tribes do not cultivate the vine or work regularly in agricultural pursuits; they depend largely on conquests to obtain these things, and when they possess themselves on such occasions of stores of liquor, they naturally indulge to excess. Mohammed undoubtedly was witness at one time or another, of such excesses and of the evil results thereof in such inflammable people as the Arabs. But certainly the manner in which a constantly warring, unsettled race conducts and regulates its existence is neither productive of a civilized state nor can be looked upon as an example to be followed by the world at large. Neither can a religious system especially adapted to such a people be a perfect one or one that may be adopted universally.

So if Mohammed says: "Thou shalt not drink wine," while Christ by his own example shows that drinking wine is not only in itself sinless, but may be indulged in to human advantage or as a harmless if not beneficient feature of man's manner of living, it is not difficult to choose between the two and recognize that Christ's attitude is beyond all comparison the better of the two, from a natural as well as from a moral standpoint.

It deserves to be noted in this connection that although Mohammed recognizes Jesus as a great prophet, putting him in a class with Abraham and Moses, he considers himself as greater than Christ and as having superseded him; in fact, Mohammed thinks that, finally and ultimately, he is the only true prophet of God or Allah, all other prophets being merely his forerunners.

There were other great religious teachers who explicitly forbade or restricted the use of wine and other alcoholic beverages. Thus, for instance, the mystic person who is the founder of Buddhism incorporated in his moral code the injunction: "Thou shalt not become intoxicated," this injunction being the fifth law of the Buddhistic decalogue. But it will be noticed that unlike Mohammedanism, Buddhism does not outright forbid the drinking of wine or other alcoholic beverages, but merely the excessive use thereof, "not to become intoxicated," an attitude which, partly at least, coincides with that of true Christianity as exemplified by Christ himself. So that it may be said that the second greatest of all religions, Buddhism, agrees with Christianity with regard to the drink question.

As prohibition was established by the Mohammedan races considerably more than a thousand years before Christians seriously thought of

making men temperate by these means, so the Chinese government forbade the use of intoxicants eleven centuries before Christ, e. i., as long as three thousand years ago. Does it not seem a serious reflection on the growth and true understanding of the Christian spirit that a Christian nation should try to solve a sociological problem by methods employed thousands of years ago by admittedly inferior civilizations and by religious creeds presumed to be less perfect than the Christian, and that in direct contravention to the example so obviously and strikingly set by the great founder of the Christian religion!

IV.

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE DRINK PROBLEM AND THE ATTITUDE OF THE PROHIBITIONISTS.

As Christ is the Measure in All Things for all men and especially for Christians, we may now, after having examined his standpoint on the question of temperance, and more particularly with regard to drinking wine, make a direct and summarized comparison of his attitude with that of our prohibitionists.

Christ invoked even his supernatural powers (habitually, says Lyman Abbott) to supply wine to the people, and he did not in a single instance utter a word against the sale of wine.

OUR PROHIBITIONISTS would make the selling, buying and giving away of wine and liquor, in any form and even in the smallest quantities, a crime, and they brand all those as sinners and criminals who supply liquor to the public, thus making according to their notions, **CHRIST HIMSELF APPEAR AS A DELIBERATE SINNER AND THEMSELVES SUPERIOR TO HIM AND BETTER THAN HE.**

CHRIST himself indulged freely in wine, thus showing by his own example, which is always forcible and to the point, that this indulgence is as natural as harmless, and that it is good to drink in moderation to make the heart glad.

OUR PROHIBITIONISTS hold everyone using wine or any other alcoholic liquor, no matter how diluted or weak, in contempt, as being neither a true Christian nor an irreproachable citizen. Their attitude reduces Christ not only to a "winebibber," as the Pharisees (the prohibitionists of his day) called him, but to **A WEAK AND DANGEROUS MAN WHO BY HIS EXAMPLE MIGHT LEAD THOUSANDS, IF NOT MILLIONS, ASTRAY.**

CHRIST honored wine on one of the most solemn occasions of his life by drinking and using it as a symbol of his very blood and life. There was nothing preventing him from using water or milk or diluted honey or fig juice, but he didn't. Out of all the possible beverages that he might have used, he chose one which, when taken intemperately, by weak individuals, will cause drunkenness.

OUR PROHIBITIONISTS, on the other hand, consider all fermented and distilled liquor as no better than a concoction of the devil, as is witnessed, for instance, by the fanatic zeal with which they will destroy large quantities of liquor whenever they have an opportunity to do so. In partaking of the Lord's Supper, they generally still use wine, but in view of their conviction that the ordinary use of wine is sinful, their use of it in the Lord's sacrament seems a highly hypocritical if not a contemptuous performance, and, strictly speaking, although they do not seem to know it, they dishonor the symbol as well as the sacrament itself. Moreover, Christ

in the Last Supper did not merely wet his tongue as a matter of ceremony, but drank like a man, gently and softly, satisfying a natural want.

CHRIST refused to join the prohibitionists of his day and become a total abstainer, wherefore those prohibitionists called him a glutton and a winebibber.

OUR PROHIBITIONISTS practically hold that anyone who differs in his views on temperance from them and therefore refuses to join their ranks is not, strictly speaking, a Christian, **THUS DECLARING, BY DIRECT INFERENCE, THAT CHRIST HIMSELF WAS NOT A CHRISTIAN. THEY, THEREFORE, CONSTANTLY CALL HIM SOMETHING MUCH WORSE THAN A GLUTTON AND A WINEBIBBER.**

Whom Shall We Follow—Jesus Christ or Mohammed?

Verily, St. Paul's condemnation, above quoted, of those who put the little things and their own conceit in place of the life that Christ means us to have, applies with much greater force to the professional prohibitionists of our day.

It may be asserted that conditions have changed so much since the time of Christ that an indulgence which he could permit himself in his day, is productive of much evil in our country and in our times. But drunkenness and intemperance is equally an evil at all times, and drunkenness as such was well recognized in his time as an evil and the Pharisees condemned not only drunkenness, but even moderate drinking, and Christ was accordingly severely denounced because he refused to abstain. We find further, for instance, that the apparent mental vigor exhibited by the apostles, after the Holy Ghost had descended upon them, was decried by many as being nothing but wine-inspired eloquence. ("These men are full of new wine.") In I Corinthians, 11:20-22, Paul makes such reference to drunkenness: "When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is impossible to eat the Lord's supper: for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken." Likewise in Ephesians (5:18): "And be not drunk with wine wherein is excess." Moreover, as we have seen, Mohammed, who lived only six centuries after Christ and under the same climatic conditions, considered drinking wine sufficiently as a vice to forbid its use altogether. **Whom are we to follow as our Supreme Moral Guide and Leader, Mohammed or Christ?** Whose words and example shed the greater light and give the truer life? Our professional prohibitionists assert incessantly that they are working solely for Christ's kingdom, but as a matter of fact nothing can be more certain than that in prohibiting the use of wine or other alcoholic liquor in order to produce among men the outward semblance of temperance, they are emphatically and unequivocally **followers of Mohammed and not of Christ,** and that they just as emphatically and unequivocally denounce by implication the tolerant attitude of Christ who taught men that virtue was a quality of the soul to be valued for its own sake and not because of the material advantages that might arise to him that acts it. It is the law of Mohammed which our prohibitionists are endeavoring to realize with such zeal and earnestness in our country in direct and passionate contravention of the example of Christ. Regarding this point, therefore, they have really no right whatever to call themselves Christians; they ought to call themselves what they are—Mohhammedans or Moslems. Nor is their treatment and attempted solution of the drink problem the only striking point of resemblance between the Mohammedans and themselves. As Mohammed, while admitting Jesus to be a prophet on an equality with Abraham, Moses and others, considers himself as having superseded Christ and as greater than he, so our prohibitionists, in word as

well as act, agree with Mohammed in his estimate of himself. A further similarity between prohibitionism and Mohammedism is found in the fact that both favor the use of legalized force, reinforced by any other force that might be handy, to put their doctrine into effective general practice. The Mohammedan has great respect for the power of the sword for this purpose, while the prohibitionist makes use of lobbies, blacklisting, intimidation, etc. (Only recently a local paper, noted for its hypocrisy and unfair methods, urged strongly that the city of St. Louis be commercially blacklisted on account of its stand on prohibition!)

Those preachers particularly who are always talking "liquor, liquor," ought really to consider themselves specialized Mohammedan dervishes working off their frenzy and deeming themselves in their own conceit better and wiser than Christ. Not that I mean to imply that all, or even most, preachers who believe in prohibition are of that kind. I have known some such preachers whom I esteem highly even as preachers and whom I consider men of great ability, strong men, sincere men, men who in many ways seem to be born spiritual leaders. But preachers of high ability who are true disciples of Christ do not, as a rule, make prohibition one of the primary goals of their endeavors, still less their only and chief goal; they know that the world is full of far more insidious sins and forms of intemperance than intemperance by drinking; they know that drinking intemperately is often more an effect than a cause; they know that the church of Christ works by faith and not by legalized force, and that it surrenders its true and exalted function when it substitutes law for faith and when preachers are politicians rather than ethical and ecclesiastical shepherds.

A Congregational minister who was ousted from the Association of Congregational Churches and Ministers because he endeavored to follow in the footsteps of his Master on the question of temperance, relates that another minister of that church confessed to him that he was much better off financially as a prohibition propagandist than he ever had been as a regular pastor, inasmuch as he was now getting 60 per cent of all the money he could collect from churches and private persons, the remaining 40 per cent going to the national prohibition officers from whom he received his territory. We may add that it also requires a much smaller degree of ability to be such a propagandist than a regular pastor, as the latter must prepare two different sermons each week and must keep himself more or less conversant with the multiplicity of subjects which comprise human life in its relation to religion, while the former can make one and the same speech do all the year around and get along by studying just one subject and that one not very well, for he will ignore the Bible whenever it suits him on the one hand, and, in the last analysis, also the actual conditions in the lives of men. He can, of course, prove anything if you grant him the premises which he submits as facts, but he does not undertake to prove these alleged facts in their fundamental bearings and interrelations, and neither does his audience.

If the second-rate ministers who are not able enough to maintain themselves as regular pastors and who do not know enough of God's purpose (even where it is plainly revealed) or man's destiny to make an impression except by singing the same old song of liquor and urging the substitution of law for faith and grace will continue to hold sway, it is only a question of time when the Church of Christ will be turned into a vaudeville show for the special benefit of the anti-liquor societies, anti-tobacco societies, or anti-something societies. That would mean the death knell of the true and inspirational work of the church.

The writer is reminded here of a friend of his, a Baptist minister, who was an unconditional prohibitionist of the most pronounced type; in fact, the leader of the prohibition faction in his town, and who later

on became a traveling propagandist. He was not only ardent and tireless in denouncing the sale and use of liquor, but equally emphatic against the use of tobacco. The writer heard him declaim once: "I never could see what anyone could find in this foul and nasty weed (tobacco), I never could understand how any man could endure to carry around one of those vile and disgusting tobacco pipes. If he would throw it on the street, not a dog would smell at it," etc. Now it happened that this minister had a son, a very popular and, indeed, lovable young man of whom the father was very fond. The son, although a clean and temperate boy in every way, would not hesitate to take a drink occasionally, and, moreover, he often smoked and always carried a tobacco pipe around in his mouth. One day the writer, without making any reference to the well-known fact that the son occasionally drank, asked the father: "How is it, Dr. ——, that you, who are such a bitter opponent of the use of tobacco, yet allow your son to smoke a pipe without molestation whenever he is so inclined?" Just a perceptible shadow of embarrassment flitted across the preacher's brow before he answered: "Well, you see, my son does not really smoke. He merely carries that pipe around with him, because it is a souvenir and because he is so fond of it." "No, Dr. ——," I replied, "allow me to say that the reason you let your son smoke while publicly you denounce smoking is that in relation to your son you are sensible and human, while in your public declarations you go out of your true self and are less sincere than you are in relation to your son."

The man looked at me with wide open eyes and made no reply. He has not made a reply to this day.

Spiritual Degeneration the Cause of Emotional Drunkenness.

In view of this perversion of Christianity which has been exemplified by Christ, is it any wonder that a so-called evangelist can travel through the country and defile, in the name of Christ, the ears of men and women with language which often becomes so base, so indescribably vile, that any other man who would utter such words in the presence of gentlemen or ladies would not be tolerated in their company for a moment; a man who, for instance, in his sermon on dancing brands our women as inherently so vicious and so sin-inspiring that their touch, especially in dancing, is always defiling; a man who paints God as a universal devil, who takes an infinite, insatiable delight in consigning men to fire and brimstone for their natural weaknesses. Yet this man has been immeasurably lauded and worshipped by a hypocritical and cowardly press, and being well paid by the promoters and a vaudeville-loving multitude, is growing enormously rich. If this man were a great religious leader it would, of course, be eminently proper for all men, women and children to emulate him and adopt his language. Just imagine our women and children flinging about in their daily talk, the vile expressions and unspeakable vituperations of this spiritual degenerate! But if it were possible to pervert our women and children to the extent that they would talk like this man, we would have only ourselves to blame, and we would behold only the fruit of our hypocrisy. Moreover, since this man, like others of his kind, denounces adultery, gambling, prostitution, etc., in the same breath and on the same grounds as drinking (not drunkenness only, but just drinking!), it takes no stretch of the imagination to see that he puts the Lord Jesus Christ in a class with the adulterer, the prostitute and the gambler. Can anyone say that such vicious and unbridled intemperance of speech, calculated to arouse and inflame emotional intemperance and reduce religious services to the level

of a coarse vaudeville show, can possibly be the source of true temperance in any way? Is not such emotional intemperance the most favorable condition for breeding all sorts of popular hysterias which will cloud the judgment and lead people astray from the serious business that confronts them? Judging all things by their effects or "fruits," is not vicious speech, ethically, on a level with "swearing," aye, sometimes even worse than the worst kind of cursing? Do you believe that mental and moral intemperance will help to overcome physical intemperance? Is it not rather apparent that this kind of intemperance will in the end prove one of the strongest allies of all other kinds of intemperance?

Nor must it be forgotten that it is the temperate mind, the mind that can control itself, although it will readily rise on the wings of enthusiasm, which will be the most successful and most effective in business as well as in emergencies. This is especially true in times like the present, when the safety of the nation must depend on the men who have the temper of steel, readily striking fire when necessary, but never losing their self-control. The safety of our country could not be left to those apron-stringed boys who never grow up, nor to those men whose mouths gush over with evil-smelling words, especially when such words are shamelessly launched under the banner of righteousness and religion.

Hence the tremendous importance of temperance of mind and soul,

a temperance which is of much more significance and consequence than mere physical temperance. Mental and moral temperance are more apt to be enduring and permanent because the cause—a principle, an idea, a memory—will endure, while purely physical temperance may pass away with the external cause or barrier. Mental and moral temperance always begets and includes physical temperance, but physical temperance can very well exist side by side with the worst cases of mental and moral intemperance, as witness, for instance, the so-called evangelistic propagandists above referred to, who are frequently neither temperate in speech nor conscientiously truthful in their statements and utterances, and who are often recruited from men that were formerly physical drunkards according to their own confessions. Thus it is that we are expected to learn temperance from the uncanny afterglow of drunken debaucheries and burnt-out desires rather than from the pure reflections of the true, manly, fearless and whole-hearted temperance of Christ!

V.

WHAT NATIONS HAVE USED AND ARE USING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES?

Let us now turn our attention to a very brief historical examination of the regard in which the fermented juice of the vine, as well as other fermented and distilled liquor has been held by the leading nation of ancient and modern times.

The Greeks, the most highly civilized people of antiquity, used wine regularly at all times, although it appears that the most warlike tribe among them, the Spartans, liked a strong soup, made of fresh blood animals, as well as wine. It must be remembered, however, that the Spartans, although the most efficient warriors of Greece, were far inferior to the Athenians in general human culture, the arts and those intellectual accomplishments whose fruits have become the heritage of all ages. It is the Athenians chiefly who made Ancient Greece immortal, not the less indulgent Spartans. The Greeks indeed held **oinos**, the fermented fruit

of the vine, in such esteem that its introduction into Greece and its culture was ascribed to one of the leading deities, namely, Dionysos.

The world-conquering Romans used wine daily with their meals, very much as we use coffee and tea, etc. Like the Greeks, they drank it regularly and used it in their sacrificial rites, as you can easily convince yourself in reading the leading Latin authors.

The Ancient Germans (which name includes the forebears of the Germans of today, as well as of the English, Danes, Dutch, and to a great extent even the French) drank a liquid called Met or Mead which was made by fermentation from honey. When the Germans learnt from the Romans to drink of the superior grape wine, they abandoned the use of Met. But they always remained temperate, although they always drank.

Among the modern nations, we find that the peoples who are the leaders in civilization are without exception users of alcoholic liquors, especially wine and beer. Notable among these are the French, English, Germans, Italians, Americans and Japanese, etc., as well as such smaller nations as the Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, etc. The French and Italians as well as the Germans have long been noted for their temperateness. But in recent years the drinking of distilled liquor, especially absinthe, seems to have turned Frenchmen somewhat from their traditional wine-drinking sobriety. Of the Italians, who perhaps have always consumed more wine than any other nation and among whom drunkenness was practically unknown, it is now also said that in recent years some intemperance has disclosed itself here and there among them as a result of the consumption of strong distilled liquor, a habit which has been transplanted to Italy from South America. The temperateness of the Germans is due to their predilection for beer and light wines. The English and Americans have not the reputation of the French and Italians for sobriety, partly because they have always indulged more or less in stronger liquor than wine or beer, and, partly, on account of climatic and other conditions, while the Swedes, Norwegians, Danes and Scotch have long been among the drunkenest nations chiefly because they used until very recently almost exclusively distilled liquor of the strongest kind. But the English, Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, Scotch and Americans have all endeavored for many years to make themselves more temperate by legislation and propaganda, with the difference, however, that while the Swedes, Norwegians, Danes and even the English have worked wisely and scientifically and, therefore, with a considerable measure of success, in our own country this very important work has been left largely to unscientific zealots and paid professional propagandists, with the result that our efforts have, by far in most cases, not only ended in failure, but have even served to intensify intemperance in drinking and in other things, so that now we have a great deal of prohibition, but much less real temperance than formerly.

If we compare the nations above mentioned with the Russians, who in spite of many strong qualities have been culturally backward, we come to some surprising conclusions. We find that wine never became universally popular in Russia and that the Russians, when they drink, show strong preference for a distilled liquor of inferior quality, called vodka, and that they are extremely prone to excessive indulgence, and that, though on the whole much less liquor is consumed in Russia than in the western countries, a great deal more of pronounced drunkenness can be observed in Russia than in those countries where fermented liquor, wine and beer are drunk universally, t.i., by all classes of people and by practically all ages. We also find that these Russians, who fluctuate between total abstinence and drunkenness (the upper and

nether grinding stones of intemperance) and hence are intemperate in one extreme or the other, are also equally intemperate, ill-poised and unbalanced in matters of religion and politics. Yet these same Russians, according to such reports as we have been able to get, refused to submit without a struggle when the edict went forth from the emperor, less than two years ago, that no more liquor of any kind should be sold, refused to admit themselves a nation of minors who cannot even be trusted with the care of their own physcial persons. That is to say, the Russians made no open organized protest when the prohibitory edict went into force and effect, but illegally and privately, their protests were exceedingly vigorous insomuch as thousands of illicit distilleries sprung up in Russia soon after prohibition was imposed upon the country—not less than 1,825 of these distilleries were discovered in the first six months, so that the total number, including those that were not discovered, can only be imagined, and the government was compelled to increase the fine for illicit distilling from 2500 rubles to 6000 rubles and imprisonment from two months to one year and four months. And still illicit distilling and drinking grows apace, and the attempt to suppress the drinking of alcoholic beverages altogether will be just about as successful in Russia as the attempt in that country, some hundreds of years ago, to suppress smoking by cutting off men's noses. Since the prohibitory edict went into force in Russia, drinks have been made in large quantities from denatured alcohol, wood alcohol, varnish and other poisonous and execrable substances, resulting in numerous cases in total blindness and death.

At the same time no attempt has been made to introduce absolute or "bone-dry" prohibition in Russia, as reports made current by propagandists in this country might make us believe, the sale of beer and wine being left untouched by the prohibitory edict, so that the communities can decide for themselves as to whether or not they will permit the sale of these drinks within their jurisdictions, an arrangement which resembles our local option laws.

Noah, the Only Man Worthy to be Saved from the Deluge, the Father of Drinking Among the Jews.

Regarding the Jews, the original standard-bearers of the great monotheistic idea and the foundation-builders of the Christian religion, in relation to the drink problem, we find that the Old Testament contains many pertinent references concerning this matter. One of earliest incidents relative to this subject is found in Genesis. Noah, who with his family was the only survivor from the deluge, becomes drunk in his tent by indulging too freely in the fermented fruit of the vine. This incident is quite instructive. Ham, one of the three sons of Noah, jeering at the temporary weakness of his father and holding himself manifestly morally superior to him: is truly the earliest prototype of the intolerant and narrow-sighted prohibitionist, while the other two sons, Shem and Japheth, are more generous and more temperate (morally) and altogether truer types of the Jewish character as it afterwards developed itself.

Throughout the Old Testament we find proofs that the ancient Jews were fond of wine and used it habitually. Thus we read in Psalm 103: "And that wine may cheer the heart of man;" in Proverbs, 31-6: "Give strong drink to him that is ready to perish and wine unto those that be heavy of heart." In Chronicle we read also (II, 10) that Solomon gave to Hiram's servants who cut the timber for his temple **twenty thousand measures of wine**, t.i., 100,000 gallons.

The Jews used wine in the celebration of their religious rites and festivals **by the express command of God.** "And for a drink-offering thou shalt offer the third part of a hin of wine, for a sweet savour unto the Lord" (Numbers, XV:7). "And thou shalt bring for a drink offering half a hin of wine, for an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord" (Numbers, XV:10). Moses, in the name of Jehovah, permitted the people to spend their tithe money "for wine or for strong drink" (Deut. XIV:26). This is all the more remarkable when it is considered that the Jewish government was originally a theocracy, a government in which God alone was the Supreme Ruler and Lawgiver, not a certain "god," but the One and Only God whom the Christians and all true believers also recognize and worship.

Now if the use of alcoholic beverages was not only permitted, but even recommended and commanded for certain purposes under a God-Government, this should certainly be conclusive scriptural proof that nothing could be further from God's design than to impose total abstinence or prohibition on His "chosen" people or on any other people. The theory that this wine was not real, fermented wine is too absurd to deserve specific and formal refutation. There are numerous instances in the Old as well as in the New Testament referring to intemperance and drunkenness in the use of wine that the mere suggestion that by "yayin" was meant grape juice (an entirely modern invention) is only possible to wilful ignorance; for to any one who honestly takes the trouble nothing will be found more certainly established in this connection than that by "yayin" was always meant real, t.i., fermented wine.

In the light of this fact, namely, that the Jews have, from very early times, used wine, it is certainly highly significant that they have remained to this day one of the healthiest, soberest and most temperate peoples.

All Drinking Races Are Strong; All Abstemious Races Are Decadent.

In concluding this short chapter, the fact deserves especial notice that the inhabitants of rigorous climes are greater eaters and more carnivorous, and that they are also greater drinkers than those that live in warmer and more temperate climes, for alcohol helps to burn up and digest this heavy food. Still more interesting is the universal fact that **all strong and predominant races are given to strong drink. The abstemious races are all decadent.** History teaches on all sides with remarkable emphasis that energy, initiative and enterprise belong in a pre-eminent degree to the drinking races. We need only compare, for instance, the Germans, the English and Americans with the Spaniards, Turks and Hindus; but the most striking example is furnished by the two yellow races. The Chinese are sober and decadent, the drinking Japanese are enterprising, alert, virile and more actively intelligent. Drunken Scotland has produced not only the most capable and successful pioneers, but also a proportionately larger number of the deepest and most clear-headed thinkers than the great majority of other races. I do not assert that these races are alert, capable and endowed with virile intelligence because they drink, but the fact remains that drink and racial energy go together. Drink may be merely the inevitable radiation of the surplus of the fire of racial energy; but the fact remains that nations that are without this exhilarating radiation are also without the energy.

VI.

CONCERNING THE NATURE AND GENERAL USE OF ALCOHOL.

Fermented liquor of one kind or another has been made and drunk

since time immemorial and practically all nations that have written histories have used it more or less—with a few exceptions almost continuously—while savages or nations that have not risen above a comparatively primitive culture have also been manufacturers and consumers of the subtle liquid gained from the best fruits and seeds of plants, although, generally, to a much smaller extent than the more civilized races. This is surely a significant fact. Not that we mean to infer that the consumption of any kind of alcoholic liquor is in itself a necessary adjunct of a higher culture, but the use of liquor certainly implies sociability and, among other things, that desire for individual happiness which always receives man's first and perhaps most lasting attention. That is what the use of wine fundamentally means: the enjoyment of things for which God has supplied the material and out of which man has fashioned things and substances for the furtherance of his well-being and for the relief of the burdens which life naturally imposes upon him.

In illustration and support of this fact we find, for instance, that the chosen people who were extremely careful, even scrupulous, as to the things that it was proper for them to eat and drink—far more careful and scrupulous than the American people have as yet dreamt of being—held wine, physically and religiously, in the highest regard.

Only the most primitive savage indeed uses herbs, fruits and the flesh of animals nearly as he finds them. The civilized man prepares his food and drink laboriously and with thoughtful care; he cooks, seasons, cures, brews, them with painstaking conscientiousness. He often subjects food, before eating it, to changes which in the case of the savage are performed by the digestive organs themselves. The savage can afford to do this for his vital forces are not called upon to expend themselves for higher and subtler activities; he spends an immense amount of energy in digestion alone, energy which the civilized man largely diverts into channels where they produce results more nearly commensurate with his ambition and destiny. Paraphrasing a saying of Moliere's: "Man digests to live, he does not live to digest." Whatever will facilitate this process of elaborating physical power without in any way supererogating altogether nature's work or eliminating any function that is essential for the health of the individual, by making the harnessed forces of nature perform it for him as much as possible, will aid man to live less wastefully and more effectively. It is in accordance with this subtilizing evolution of the process of digestion that, for instance, the so-called appendix serves no longer any use in man's body, but is actually in the way and a source of danger, while a great many people may be found who no longer grow the original number of teeth, but only twenty-eight, probably because man does not have to depend so much on his teeth in preparing his food, and probably also because he needs additional bone material for his larger skull.

Such animals as our esteemed and highly appreciated cow use an immense amount of energy in order to transform grass, hay and other coarse substances into blood and muscle. Indeed the cow's digestive system is a powerful and wonderful chemical apparatus, so powerful that if the energy thus expended by the cow in the course of a few days only were reduced to foot-pounds, the energy developed by some of the most colossal engines of peace or war might seem insignificant. On the other hand, such animals as the lion, tiger, wolf, etc., derive and maintain their physical strength and prowess largely from substances which closely resemble their own bodies; their energy is therefore restored and replenished so directly and immediately that the original desires and powers of the animal are supplied and stimulated so quickly and sud-

denly that there is no chance for the development of those intricate processes and finer elements needed by the higher organism of the thinking animal. The cow uses overmuch energy in assimilating her food, she is a manufacturer of beef and milk; the beast of prey takes, as it were, the finished product piping hot from the mouth of nature. Neither of these processes is congenial to the development of the rational mind, for the organism which is to develop the thinking brain can neither harbor an immense chemical laboratory for the sole purpose, almost, of assimilating food, nor be the receptacle for such naked vital energy. Man must assimilate his food with the expenditure of a well proportioned amount of energy, but the process must be in tune with his intellectual activities, taking all things from the hands of nature and transforming them, partly by his own devices, into a multiplicity of new things, new stimuli, new energies; in other words, he must become in a double sense a re-creator, even in sustaining his physical powers, in order to establish and maintain the harmony and balance between the activities of the mind and the body.

(No wonder that the preparation of our foods and drinks is considered such an absorbing and vital function; no wonder that we entrust cooking preferentially to our good mothers and wives; no wonder that the French, who above all others appreciate good wine and realize that not only is "the surest way to the heart of man in a well cooked dinner," but that it is also one of the surest ways to the mind of man; no wonder that the drink problem is of such transcending importance.)

Alcohol Saves Vital Energy.

Ordinary alcohol, technically called ethyl alcohol, in distinction from methyl, butyl and other kinds of alcohol, is found in a natural state in a number of green fruits and plants, but it is produced in large quantities and of purer quality from the seeds and fruits of various plants, sometimes also from the roots, by processes of fermentation and distillation. It is the intoxicating and stimulating element in wine, beer, whiskey, brandy, etc. When drunk with right measure, it promotes digestion by performing part of that combustion of the food which otherwise would fall wholly on the glands of the digestive apparatus and the nervous system, so that judiciously used, it is like a flame supplementing in the body that process of digestion which is begun outside of the body by cooking and other preparation of the food. Injudiciously used, it will injure the vessel in which it performs this supplementary aid to digestion, just as any vessel will be injured by fire when the water or other liquid which it contained is boiled away or when the heat of the fire is too intense.

Indeed, one of the most remarkable physiological effects of alcohol, used moderately, is to assimilate, energize and transmute natural force more quickly from the material taken in the form of food, especially food that contains plenty of albumen. Alcohol accomplishes in a higher, more intensified and somewhat modified degree the effects that are produced by meat, coffee, tea, etc., and that is true in spite of the inhibitory effects also due to alcohol. When used intemperately, however, the body becomes over-energized, and its effect is decidedly destructive.

(This is true notwithstanding that there is between the effect from coffee and tea and the effect from alcohol a very deep and subtle difference which it would be quite futile to attempt to define or account for outside of a philosophic treatise, for after all, as compared with the comforting, wakeful, aromatic water called coffee (which has been declared to act more strongly on some nerves than wine or brandy), and the wonderful delicious insipidity from steeped leaves, wine is indeed a spirit, evil to those whose hearts are weak or evil, but, when of the right age and temper, more delightful than the finest tea to those who have conquered the baser movements of the flesh.)

Alcohol produces Partial Sleep and is Next to Natural Sleep One of the Greatest Restoratives.

It must be admitted, however, that to a great extent the effect of alcohol on the human body is still clouded in mystery, scientifically speaking, even in the face of the highly developed chemical, physiological and biological sciences. On the whole, it seems to inhibit or temporarily paralyze many of those functions of the body which ordinarily are in action, while rousing and stimulating a great many functions which ordinarily are neglected or in a state of dormancy. In this way a restoration is effected which is highly beneficial when pure, well matured beverages of low proof are used temperately, although the excessive use especially of raw distilled liquor will have in most cases an injurious effect as it tends to weaken and paralyze certain organs, and, when persisted in, to produce a condition of premature old age. This explains according to the late Prof. William James, the American philosopher, why men of certain professions, printers for instance, whose occupation is very monotonous and "unnatural," show strong tendencies to inebriety, the effect of a "spree" being like the shaking given an old carpet, or as Prof. James has it, like bringing out the second wind, t. i., all those dormant forces which ordinarily find no opportunity for display, while forcibly putting to rest those forces which ordinarily are overworked.

The late Hugo Münsterberg, who was beyond question one of the greatest psychologists of his time, says in his "American Problems:"

"The inhibiton by alcohol, too, may have in the right place its very desirable purpose, and no one ought to be terrified by such physiological statements, even if inhibition is called a partial paralysis. Yes, it is partial paralysis, but no education, no art, no politics, no religion is possible without such partial paralysis. What else are hope and belief and enjoyment and enthusiasm but re-enforcement of certain mental states, with corresponding inhibition—that is paralysis—of the opposite ideas? If a moderate use of alcohol can help in this most useful blockade, it is an ally and not an enemy. If wine can overcome and suppress the consciousness of the little miseries and of the drudgery of life, and thus set free and re-enforce the unchecked enthusiasm for the dominant idea, if wine can make one forget the frictions and pains and give again the feeling of unity and frictionless power—by all means let us use this helper to civilization. It was a well-known philosopher who couples Christianity and alcohol as the two great means of mankind to set us free from pain. But nature provided mankind with other means of inhibition; sleep is still more radical, and every fatigue works in the same direction; to inhibit means to help and to prepare for action." Further on he says: "We know today too well that physical exercise and sport is not real rest for the exhausted brain cells. The American masses work hard throughout the day. The sharp physical and mental labor, the constant hurry and drudgery produces a state of tension and irritation which demands before the night's sleep some dulling inhibition if a dangerous unrest is not to set in. Alcohol relieves that daily tenson most directly."

Alcohol, accordingly, produces a condition in which part of the brain or part of the organism may rest or sleep, while other parts remain awake, thus enabling men to enjoy life while refreshing themselves by a rest which cannot be obtained in any other way. This fact explains more than anything else why the world's leading nations have used alcohol for hundreds, aye, for thousands of years.

Externally, alcohol is highly antiseptic. It is one of the greatest foes of putrefaction and of great benefit in skin troubles. Indeed its use in hospitals and operating rooms has become more pronounced than ever, many surgeons seeming to prefer it to other antiseptics for many purposes. The chemist tells us that alcohol is a releaser of fat, since it oxidizes to a certain extent in the body. It is to this quality that the fattening effect of alcoholic beverages is attributed, an effect which, when employed with moderation, is also of great value in building up the human system.

Quasi-Religious Intoxication Resembles the Alcoholic.

Many of the semi-civilized races are frequently as readily intoxicated by a quasi-religious frenzy as by liquor. Apparently, they are no more fully capable of moral and spiritual stimulation than of physiological stimulation, their reaction being in either case too violently mechanical. For religious frenzy does not as a rule imply true religious recognition, it is rather the other extreme of irreligiosity, although it is sometimes a genuine attempt to attain that true ethical-spiritual state which is nothing but love of God and man, t. i., righteous living. That intoxication by means of distorted and perverted religious beliefs and suggestions is by no means uncommon among the white races of the present day is abundantly proved in our own country. Also in Russia—that country which in so many manifestations of abnormality and excess, strangely enough, so strongly resembles our own. Thus Maxim Gorky, the famous Russian author, who is certainly well acquainted with the common people of his own country, makes one of his characters kneel before a statue of the Virgin Mary, just before setting out to murder a Jewish merchant for his money, and pray to her after this fashion: "O, Mother of God, let me be successful this once in my enterprise (of murdering the Jew) and I will always worship Thee thereafter and commit nothing any more that is displeasing to Thee." He thereupon drinks heavily, and armed with this double intoxication, he starts out on his bloody journey. But it is just as little the vodka as his "religion" which compels him to the heinous deed, **he merely uses both as levers to enable him to act as he wants to act**; they are merely two factors which play the part of subsidiary forces by means of which he rouses himself to the carrying out of the evil thought which he has long nursed in is heart. The devil is in him, identified with his fundamental moral self, not in his religion nor in the vodka, and this devil will not allow him to assimilate either his religious creed or his vodka to normal and natural ends, but employs them both as instruments for his murderous design.

VII.

THE SUPPOSED SCIENTIFIC DEATH RATES OF NON-ABSTAINERS AS COMPARED WITH THAT OF ABSTAINERS.

From the acts of the professional prohibitionists it is evident that they are working with all their might and main, whether consciously or not, to make self-deceit and hypocrisy a national vice. They think they understand the causes and conditions that are responsible for intemperance, but when you learn that they are not even able to honestly read the Bible which they constantly carry in their hands, how much reliance, do you suppose, can be put into their assertions which are presumably based upon knowledge derived from an insight which is infinitely more difficult to obtain than to study the simple words of the New Testament? As a matter of fact, they see only that in the New Testament which suits their own purposes, they can see only as much of the light as their own prejudice has not extinguished. If they thus pervert the plain meaning of the words and acts of **"their Master,"** what will you expect of them, when it is a question of getting statistics from nature and the world? Will they not allow perversion of facts and misrepresentation of conditions to run riot if only they can make out a case? Will they not make the fullest use of all the subtle ways in which figures can be made to lie? (Remember that Andrew Carnegie said that "figures can be made to lie in as many ways as there are lives

in a cat," and that although figures themselves do not lie, the most effective and deceiving lying can be done by means of figures.) Right here it is where their self-deceit takes firm root, after which it spreads rapidly and soon overshadows their whole mind. Many striking instances can be cited in support of this fact. Thus while the prohibitionists have always zealously advocated self-government for any state or district of such a state, when they were engaged in fighting local option campaigns, they hesitated not a moment to utterly disregard this principle, when it was a question to force prohibition on the people of the District of Columbia without giving the people of the District even a chance to express their opinion of the imposition of such a law on them, much less to give them a chance to decide the issue for themselves. But can you expect that they will treat their fellowmen with more honesty and consistency than they have treated the Founder of the Christian religion?

Figures on the Alleged Death Rates of the Users and Non-Users of Alcohol Misleading.

A great deal has been made by the prohibitionists of the mortality supposed to be shown by those who imbibe even moderately in alcoholic beverages, and frequently figures are submitted to support this allegation. Let us look a little closer at these claims.

We will dismiss the mortality of those who use liquor excessively, since, for one thing, there are no figures whatever available showing that mortality on a large scale, while, on the other hand, the excessive use of tobacco, coffee, etc., as well as overeating, will probably show as great a mortality as the intemperate use of liquor. It is certainly established that abstinence from tobacco shows a more favorable mortality than abstinence from alcoholic beverages; the former being 47, while the latter is 49. We will, therefore, examine the record of those who are supposed to be moderate drinkers, since the prohibitionists claim that the mortality among those who drink moderately or only occasionally is much greater than among total abstainers. Now the only scientifically prepared data pertaining to this mortality have been gathered by certain life insurance companies, and it is the experience of these companies which the prohibitionists refer to as far as they make any pretense of giving scientific corroboration to their statements. But, although such data have been obtained by some of the insurance companies with a great deal of care, yet their scientific value is summed up by Edward Bunnell Phelps, editor of the American Underwriter, who certainly is in a position to speak authoritatively and impartially, in these words:

"The more I have collected and read and thought on the subject, the more have I been impressed with the widespread circulation of misleading figures and conclusions as to the alleged death rates of users and non-users of alcohol which in my judgment seem to be unwarranted."

Submit the Drink Problem to School Children for Solution.

Nothing illustrates more forcibly the incompetency of the prohibitionists than, for instance, the proposition which the "Anti-Saloon League of Maryland" submitted to 30,000 school children of Baltimore, in offering them prizes aggregating $3,000, for essays on the subject: "The Effect of Alcoholic Drinks Upon the Human Mind and Body." **Imagine such a problem being submitted to school children for solution; a problem which has hitherto baffled the profoundest and most capable scientific thinkers!** The material on which the children were to draw in preparing these prize essays was a 32-page pamphlet published by the Scientific Temperance Federation of Boston, which bears the same title:

"The Effect of Alcoholic Drinks Upon the Human Mind and Body." The principal data used in this pamphlet are taken from a book entitled "The Mortality of Alcohol," a book which was written by that very Edward Bunnell Phelps, who, as above quoted, considers the "widespread circulation of figures as to alleged death-rates of users and non-users of alcohol" wholly misleading and unwarranted. At the very outset in this pamphlet the startling assertion of "one death every eight minutes due to drink," is made to rest upon figures presented in Mr. Phelps' book, and the statement is further made that "alcohol carries off 1,662 adults every nine days all the year around in the U. S., 65,897 a year, according to the estimate of Edward Bunnell Phelps, based on estimates of the medical directors of three of the large life insurance companies."

Dr. Phelps Charges That Prohibitionists Misused His Own Figures.

Regarding this statement, alleged to be supported by his own book, Doctor Phelps says in a subsequent publication:

"I trust I may not seem to put myself in an ungracious position if I flatly deny my responsibility for this statement charged to me. I herewith cite from my book literal proof that I made no such estimate. (Quoting) 'In default of proof positive to the contrary it would therefore be entirely safe to assume that the total annual mortality of continental United States in which alcohol directly, indirectly or even remotely figures as a causative or contributory factor at last reports did not exceed the 66,000 deaths approximately suggested by this investigation. It should be clearly understood that this figure by no means signifies that alcohol was the direct cause of 66,000 deaths, the number in question presumably including all of the deaths in which alcohol played an appreciable contributory part. Consequently the number of deaths thus computed is not properly comparable with the number of deaths accredited to any particular cause in the Annual Mortality Statistics of the Registration Area, as in every case those figures deal with deaths immediately due to the cause named.'"

It is easy to see that what Doctor Phelps means is that in the case of any death there may be two or three or ten contributory causes, and it is more than exaggeration, it is absolute falsification to state positively that one of the contributory causes mentioned is **the one** which "carries off" the diseased person.

The Longevity of Clergymen Not Due to Abstinence Alone.

If, in the computation of the mortality of drinkers alcohol is made to bear the burden of all other contributory causes, the very same fallacious method is pursued, negatively, by the prohibitionists in accounting for the longevity of abstainers. Thus it is asserted, for instance, that the average clergyman has a lower mortality than the average man in most other callings and professions, because he generally abstains from the use of liquor! No allowance whatever is made for the very large number of other contributory causes which unquestionably tend to lengthen the clergyman's life.

Clergymen have indeed generally shown a lower mortality than the men in other callings; their mortality being found to be lower than that of the farmers who certainly lead a life which is conducive to longevity. But will it be scientific, or even ethically fair, to compare the mortality of the abstaining clergyman with the non-abstaining printer, factory worker, miner or bartender, and then conclude that the difference in mortality in favor of the clergyman is wholly due to the fact that he was an abstainer, while the men in the other callings were drinkers, whether temperate or intemperate? Does any rational person for a moment suppose that the printer, miner, factory worker or barkeeper would live anywhere nearly as long as the clergyman even though they were total abstainers, not only from alcohol but also from tobacco, coffee or any other stimulant? Is it not more than obvious that the smoky, unhealthy atmosphere in barrooms, the unnatural, monotonous occupation of the printer and miner, the irregularity of living attendant to many occupations in large cities, lower the mortality of the men thus occupied until it becomes as low as that of the physician? The printer, miner, factory-worker and bartender cannot regulate their lives as nicely and beautifully as the clergyman does who lives in a spiritual atmosphere and is outwardly surrounded by pleasant and congenial influences, so that he is able to make it his business to take care of himself. Moreover, is it not true that the non-abstaining clergyman in England, France and Germany lives just as long as his abstaining American brother? Not that we criticize or envy the clergyman for thriving upon the pleasant and beneficent "simple life," which is his share, on the contrary, we are very glad to see him live so long and so pleasantly in spite of his too meagre salary, but is it right for him to cast odium on the callings of other men by asserting or implying that their lower mortality and other disadvantages are due to intemperance? No doubt the printer, miner, factory-worker and bartender would like very much to live under the pleasant conditions which are so conducive to longevity, but since as a result of the nature of their work they must sink down into premature graves, should they not also be rather honored for laying down their lives on the altar of civilization just as the clergyman does? Yes, it is even possible for the "drain-man" who has never been inside of a church building to be more godly than the vicar or the bishop.

Method of Obtaining Death Rates of Moderate Drinkers Is Unscientific.

Concerning the scientific value of the figures obtained on the mortality of non-abstainers, we may add that this value is even considerably less than it seems to be when the figures are correctly read and truthfully interpreted and purified of the exaggeration and misapplication which they received at the hands of those who favor prohibition rather than temperance. The figures being computed from the mortality experience of a number of life insurance companies, it is pertinent to ask how these companies obtained the data underlying them. These data are practically in all cases based on the statements given by the applicants for insurance, at the time the insurance is taken out, in answer to the question whether or not and to what extent they were abstainers from alcoholic liquors. The natural tendency of the applicants is, for obvious reasons, to understate rather than overstate the amount of liquor they consume. One applicant will say that he drinks "a glass once in a while," when he may be drinking a glass nearly every day. Another will say that he takes a little occasionally, when this occasional indulgence may be measured in terms of very generous quantities. As the company makes no inquiries concerning the applicant's past indulgence, excepting in the very few cases when very large amounts of insurance are applied for, and makes no investigation with regard to the conduct of the applicant after the policy has been issued, it becomes obvious that these data rest on very slender evidence, so that the manner in which the original data were obtained does by no means deserve to be called scientific. As a result of this wholly inadequate and manifestly unscientific method a great many regular drinkers will be classed as occasional drinkers, and many that are really intermittently intemperate will be classed as moderate drinkers, so that **the mortality ascribed to the moderate drinker is really a compound of the mortality of the moderate and the intemperate drinker**, and the moderate drinker is charged with a far higher than his actual mortality.

Thus it is easy to understand why the editor of the American Underwriter should reject even the correct figures obtained by life insurance companies on the mortality of abstainers and non-abstainers as practically worthless as approximates of the actual death rates, while the distortions and exaggerations of these already unreliable figures by the prohibitionists renders them worse than useless for any scientific purpose, although highly useful for the purpose of misrepresentation and falsification.

The fallaciousness and unscrupulousness shown by the prohibitionists in pointing out the alleged mortality of the users of alcohol is not less apparent in their other demonstrations on the injurious physiological effect of alcohol when moderately used. Cirrhosis of the liver, consumption, pneumonia, hardening of the arteries especially are all readily "proved" by them as being caused in by far the majority of cases by the intemperate as well as by the temperate use of alcohol. A close, honest and impartial examination of facts and findings by physiologists, however, easily disposes of these allegations as far as the temperate use of alcohol is concerned, while even with regard to the intemperate use physiologists are by no means in agreement. Those superficial medical writers indeed who always cater to what they believe to be the prevailing sentiment (because it pays best), frequently parade all kinds of "proofs" through the columns of the press that alcohol is always and even in the smallest doses injurious; if public sentiment were blowing in the other direction, they would probably find with equal facility that alcohol is **never harmful.**

The fundamental facts involved in these allegations are, first: that alcohol, when excessively used, is a **contributory** cause in producing the morbid conditions mentioned, and, second, **that excess of any kind is especially injurious to people who are susceptible to such diseases as consumption, pneumonia, hardened arteries, etc.** A consumptive in the advanced stages, for instance, may be injured even by subjecting himself to the strong winds of the seashore or the mountain, although he is above all things in need of pure air. What air is purer and fresher than the air on the mountain, especially when in a state of rapid motion? And yet it may become an over-stimulation to which he can no longer respond. It is due to this fact that so many consumptives collapse when they come to the mountains in search of health—the mountain air forcing upon them an "intemperance" in oxidation and metabolism under which they quickly succumb, although if they had repaired to the mountain earlier, they would unquestionably have been benefited.

It would be highly interesting to examine analytically and in the light of the most competent physiological research the claims of the prohibitionists that the use of alcohol in any quantity is one of the chief causes, if not the cause, producing those dreaded diseases, but lack of space makes it entirely impossible to do so in this little volume. We have only found room to submit an analysis of the method used by prohibitionists in obtaining the supposed death rates of users and non-users of alcohol, thus giving a fair example of the methods used by them in attempting to substantiate their other claims of this character. We may, however, point out that their "physiologists" who have conducted experiments to determine the effect of small quantities of alcohol have often proceeded in such a manner as to produce the demonstration desired. Thus men were used in these experiments who are ordinarily abstainers and wholly unused to alcohol, as little children might be, and the effect on them was proclaimed as the normal action of alcohol on drinkers generally! Again, in these experiments strong distilled liquor was used on empty stomachs, etc. Much of the evidence used for these

demonstrations by prohibitionists is furnished by criminals who eagerly confess to drinking, and this kind of practically worthless evidence is then used just as eagerly and without further investigation by these professional manufacturers of unreasoned sentiment.

As to the terrifying insinuations of the prohibitionists that a nation could be wholly wiped out by alcoholism through the process of hereditary predisposition, we need only say that age-long experience of some of the older nations effectually disposes of this bogey, otherwise every one of us would be a hopeless drunkard, for there cannot be any doubt that every one of us has had some drunken ancestors.

VIII.

MORAL FREEDOM THE FOUNDATION OF TRUE TEMPERANCE.

That certain savage or semi-civilized races and weak individuals of other races do not seem to be able to use even wine and other moderately alcoholic beverages without excess is certainly no more an argument in itself that wine, beer and other liquor, when properly made, aged and moderately used, are injurious to those races that have used them with apparently good results through hundreds of generations, than it is an argument against popular government because, for instance, the French, in their first delirious outbursts over a suddenly acquired popular autonomy and freedom, ruthlessly and ferociously slaughter thousands upon thousands of their fellowmen just because they happened to be aristocrats; it is no more a valid argument than the contention that the negro is comparatively incapable of self-government is an ultimately valid argument against the emancipation of the Black Man.

U. S. Judge Pollock Declares Prohibition is a Form of Slavery.

Notwithstanding all that may be averred by those that like to dwell in the blindness of their own prejudices and passions, as well as by those, who, with good intention, believe that others should be guided by such light as they choose to give them, and notwithstanding the fact that every law is naturally a limitation of privilege and every light a cause of shadows, it still remains one of the greatest maxims of life that there never can be too much light or too much freedom. Not the light that blinds nor the freedom to do evil; for shielding the eyes against rays that are destructive rather than illuminating does not mean shunning the light, and limitation of privilege does not necessarily and fundamentally imply restriction of freedom. As Judge John Pollock, from the U. S. District Court, expressed it in October, 1915:

"It is sometimes thought one of the most difficult matters to understand why people of the Anglo Saxon race deliberately enslave themselves to the state and to the government. Because a few of the many have not the manhood and strength of character to resist the baneful effect of narcotics or intoxicants, people voluntarily put themselves in slavery to protect somebody, who is not worthy of being protected, from their use; will sacrifice those who are self-respecting to protect or bolster up some worthless scoundrels who are no earthly use to themselves or their government. Why people will do that, why this country is doing that, I do not know. But they are doing it and doing to such an extent that the people of this country will rebel in the near future.

"No people have ever before had so many masters and sovereigns dealing with them as the people of the United States. All of them are apparently striving to see how many chains they can throw around the individual citizen for the supposed good of those who have not self-respect enough to to take care of themselves. Some day the people of this country will grow tired of this; when they do, they will stop it. Then the liberty of the individual citizen will again become as sacred as is now the props by law imposed to support the moral fiber of the degenerate and weak, who are utterly useless."

Judge Pollock certainly knew what he was talking about. He does not deal with the subject theoretically from the garret of self-sacrificed purity and virtue. His knowledge is born of long and intimate experience, minute observation and careful analysis.

Now what is the keynote of Judge Pollock's vigorous denunciation of the "Anglo-Saxon" tendency to surround and hedge in a great many, if not all, people with certain absolute restrictions just because a few of them are incapable to resist the temptation that the absence of these restrictions will expose them to? The keynote is that such a tendency will produce **hyprocrisy** by making not the character, but purely external conditions the foundation of righteous conduct, so that people will be morally apparently good, not because they choose to be good, or because they base their own conduct on knowledge gained by experience in relation to their fellow men, but **because they have every external motive to do evil taken away from them,** and are thus deprived of true moral responsibility and reduced to the status of moral minors. This is assuming that virtue and vice are primarily in the "pot" rather than in the character of the man that eats and drinks from that pot, thus tending to make righteous conduct purely the mechanical result of an external machinery created by law.

Christ said (Mark VII, 18-22): "Whatever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; because it entereth not into his heart but into the belly. That which cometh out of the man that defileth the man. For from within out of the heart of man proceed evil thoughts, adulterations, fornications, murder, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness, all these things come from within and defile the man."

IX.

VARIOUS KINDS OF INTEMPERANCE, OR THE MANIFOLD ROOT OF INTEMPERANCE.

We have seen in Chapter I that temperance, in its widest sense and application, is the law of Right Measure in all human actions, indulgences and relations, the self-imposed principle of limitation which also involves the recognition of the limitations within which human actions, indulgences and relations may exercise themselves in such a way as to insure the greatest benefits to the individual as well as to the community. It is easy to see how manifold this principle may be and how difficult it is to understand it comprehensively and apply it correctly. It is also easy to see that the violation of this great principle in one of its vital forms will invariably result in its violation in other forms, so that one kind of intemperance, if not rationally and scientifically or at least sensibly dealt with (for common sense must serve us in every problem until we are able to deal with it scientifically) will often beget other and more obnoxious kinds of intemperance.

It is in recognition of this fact that the French statesman, M. Guyot, says, anent the attempt by prohibitionists at the outbreak of the war in France, to absolutely suppress the sale of wine, beer and ardent spirits: "Les tempérants, atteints d'un 'delirium' pire que le 'delirium tremens,' piétinent, déchirent et saccagent les principes élémentaires de la liberté individuelle et du respect de la propriété! Leur intoxication intellectuelle et morale est autrement dangereuse que toutes les intoxications alcooliques."

(The prohibitionists, carried away by a delirium which is worse than the delirium tremens, tear to pieces and grind under their heels the elementary principles of the

liberty of the individual and the respect of the law of decency. Their mental and moral drunkenness is at least as dangerous as any alcoholic drunkenness.)

These are the words of a man of discernment who certainly has only the welfare of his country at heart and who is unquestionably a strong advocate of true temperance. The common drunkard, indeed, is but a helpless by-product of imperfect social or natural conditions, the froth on the surface of deeper and more serious forms of intemperance, but the mental and moral "intempérant" is a serpent against which we must employ all possible vigilance, lest he make his home in our bosom and poison us unto the death from which there may not be a resurrection, even while we are boasting of legalistic goodness and purity.

Mental and moral intemperance, as well as its counterpart, mental and moral temperance, are found in numerous forms in individuals, communities and nations. There is what we shall call for want of a better term the **economic intemperance,** popularly called **greed;** the **intemperance of domination,** commonly called tyranny, autocracy gone wild or the lust to dominate; **social intemperance,** commonly recognized as ostentatious vanity or the desire to shine in contrast with your neighbor; **the intemperance of the spirit,** or spiritual pride; also the more purely **emotional intemperance** on whose wings people are carried away by natural as well as by purposely manufactured waves of sentiment which obscure the judgment and generate all kinds of excess; finally, the strictly physical forms of intemperance, such as intemperance from drinking, etc; really one of the least serious of all kinds of intemperance, although singled out by our propagandists as the most dangerous, if not as the only form of intemperance that deserves consideration, thus leaving no doubt that according to their conceptions virtue and temperance are primarily, if not wholly, of purely physical and external rather than of moral origin.

Economic intemperance, or greed, or the lust of material gain, compels, among other things, thousands and thousands of laboring people to overwork themselves in order to make a living, t. i., to **exert themselves intemperately,** thus falling often victims to premature decay and forcing them to "make themselves air" in the stifling atmosphere of poverty by means of other kinds of intemperance, especially drinking, gambling, etc. The U. S. census reports show that 75 per cent of the working population in our industrial centers get less than $15.00 per week, while more than 50 per cent get $12.00 or less per week. Can you imagine how a man can maintain and educate a family on $12.00 a week? The intemperance in drinking of people living under such conditions is therefore, at least to a very great extent, the direct result of economic intemperance of those who exploit them without adequate compensation. To what excess this greed and lust for gain may rise is illustrated by nothing more forcibly than by the universal headlong tendency after the outbreak of the war to raise prices on all commodities on the part of manufacturers, producers and those who control land properties. Think of it, in view of the frightful carnage that has been going on in Europe, we greatly intensified our passion to make money, coin money, and more money, out of the needs of our fellow men!

The intemperance of domination links itself directly to the unbridled lust for gain, since possession of great material wealth always means power. This sort of intemperance becomes especially dangerous when it seizes an individual who is placed by birth or circumstance in a position of exceptional power. If an autocratic régime had not

become intoxicated with the lust of domination, Belgium might not have been invaded and the great world war would not have assumed such frightful dimensions.

Social intemperance is perhaps responsible for as much misery, financial failure and continued poverty than perhaps any other cause. It is the desire of "Keeping up with Lizzy." If Lizzy has four silk dresses, Miss Yourself wants five or more, whether she can spare the money or not; if Lizzy has a fine limousine, Mr. and Mrs. Yourself must also have one, even though they should mortgage their future income for months or years, and sensible people will laugh at them behind their backs. And so the frightful intemperance in dress and appearance, fed assiduously by an ogre called style, "makes countless thousands mourn" with misery, ennui and want.

Sexual intemperance has since time immemorial been considered as one of the most destructive forms of intemperance, and although the monogamous marriage has more than anything else subdued it, it has by no means done away with it, a fact which has been brought home to us by such writers as Tolstoy and Bernard Shaw.

Intemperance of the spirit or spiritual pride is the most obnoxious and hateful of all forms of intemperance because it will penetrate a man through and through and corrupt his heart to the bottom without his becoming aware of it, and because it finds its way into the best guarded and most sanctified hearts and places, often making the house of God the favorite abode of the devil.

Emotional intemperance is one of the most universal manifestations of intemperance. It has often been the immediate cause of the most horrible upheavals. The horrors of the Bartholomew night, when the French without warning in one single night killed 50,000 of their own innocent men, women and children, the indescribable excesses of the French revolution (not the revolution itself), the burning of the witches, the slaughtering of Jews and Christians, in our time and country, the legalized mobbing of a Leo Frank, and, in part at least, this most hideous of all wars, are some of the bitter fruits of emotional intemperance. The great war, indeed, has probably been produced by all the principal roots of intemperance—the lust of gain (commercial intemperance), the intemperance of domination, spiritual intemperance (intensified national pride), etc.

If intemperance has such a deep and manifold ramification in our society, can we hope to abolish it by absolutely cutting out the whole root, t. i., by applying the principle of absolute prohibition? If the lust of money corrupts the heart, shall we forbid the pursuit of great wealth altogether? If the intemperate love of domination leads here and there to disaster and oppression, shall we no longer entrust any man or any body of men with public power? If the competition of our men and women in dressing and living up to an overreaching standard of ostentatious conspicuity causes envy, misery and want on all sides, shall we therefore legislate all women into a definite and uniform form of dress, and into a uniform form of living? (What a revolution we would have on our hands!) If sexual intemperance will even invade the marital relation, where in a deeper sense it may often do more injury than outside of that holy relationship, shall we therefore forthwith proceed to legislate all sanctity out of marriage in order to suppress such intemperance? If spiritual pride will infect our noblest institutions, the churches, shall we therefore put all churches under the domination of the government? And shall we forbid revivals, patriotic demonstrations and public meetings of all kinds, because they sometimes lead to excesses? And shall we in the same spirit, besides

forbidding the use of alcohol, also forbid smoking, drinking coffee, etc., indulgences which normally make the heart glad, because the abuse of these things is injurious? Shall we suppress the freedom of speech and the press, because tongues and pens are sometimes tipped with poison?

Every Man Should Find His Own Measure.

Every man should be able to find **his own measure,** but he can only find it by feeling around for his limitations. If a man cannot train himself to drink and indulge otherwise than to excess, abstinence is the only course open to him, and **by all means let him abstain.** It is his sacred duty. It is the only way for him to observe the law of temperance with regard to drinking, and to him applies the Scriptural injunction: "If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out," and "if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off." But what shall we say of the man who will insist that all other people shall also be made to cut off their arms and pluck out their eyes, because his weakness made it necessary to perform these operations on him? Does it not appear that because he had to take a drastic measure to make himself physically temperate, the inherent intemperance in him has only been driven from his body into his mind, whence it now issues under a halo of transfiguration in order to deprive others forcibly of that which he himself can neither use nor enjoy?

The professional prohibitionists have demeaned themselves like those superwise old maids, male and female, married and unmarried, who invariably know so much better how to raise other people's children than the parents themselves, and who are not aware that God and nature know best to whom to give children and from whom to withhold them, all appearance to the contrary notwithstanding, and that their own will is often itself the effect of that wisdom of nature which denies them children. (Let me not be misunderstood—I do not refer to all, nor to most, of those who are childless, for many of these have performed the very greatest service for humanity, but only to those among them who alone know how to properly bring up other people's children.)

Education and training, aided by reasonable legislation based upon experience and scientific deductions, we believe, will accomplish wonders in promoting and establishing true temperance, but we are certainly abundantly corroborated by experience that indiscriminate or absolute prohibition will not accomplish that end. Violent and unnatural suppression of long-established natural desires will nearly always produce, in individuals and communities, reactions and resurgences. So it is often found, for instance, that the natural desires and passions ruthlessly suppressed by one generation will reappear with intensified vigor in the children, bursting all bonds and causing intemperance to hold Bachanalian sway, the mental and repressive intemperance of one generation simply becoming "flesh" or physical intemperance in the next. The responsibility for such a state must be put on the shoulders of the first generation.

The great Tolstoy believed that family happiness can only be attained when that most powerful species of (sexual) emotional intemperance which is known as blind "passion" (generally miscalled love) has been overcome and true love, which is always temperate, can come into her own. But if he found selfish passion to be the greatest enemy of family happiness, it never occurred to him to suggest that somebody should straightway legislate about it, for he knew that although pas-

sion is the greatest enemy of happiness, it is nevertheless only through the instrumentality of this great enemy that love and happiness can be found.

Gluttony More Dangerous Than Drunkenness.

There is a species of intemperance which we must not wholly overlook in this discussion, because it is far more universal than alcoholic intemperance, namely **gluttony or intemperance in eating.** Now it happens that moderate drinkers are generally also moderate eaters, ceteris paribus, while those who abstain from drinking liquor of any kind are more often intemperate eaters. The effects of gluttony, if it were possible to ascertain them with any degree of accuracy, would surely be found, in the final analysis, much more far-reaching and destructive upon the health and the life of the community than intemperance from drinking. To one drunkard there would be found probably one hundred gluttons. And while intemperance from drinking shows its evil effects promptly and in the open, so that it can be readily discerned and, if possible, dealt with, intemperance from eating may be carried around like a secret enemy or hidden venom which does its work in a multiplicity of unseen ways, producing all sorts of diseases, besides some of the most abhorred species of chronic emotional intemperance, like the "grouch," the nagger, etc.

Classic writers like Tacitus, Juvenal, Petronius and others attest to the fact that gluttony was a far greater and more blighting vice than drunkenness among the Romans of their times. The famous Italian philosopher Luigi Carnero, who devoted a great part of his long life to thinking about the best way to live long and well, condemns gluttony as one of the greatest enemies of health and longevity, while his life long he included wine in his carefully selected and frugal diet.

Moral Self-Control Corresponds to Physical Resistance.

Since temperance means above all other things self-control or self-restraint toward the limits indicated as "right measure" which, of course, differ with different individuals, places and times, it follows that when reduced to a crude natural or moral force it means proper resistance to the positive impulse, desire or moving power. The greater is the resistance provided the power is adequate, the greater and more perfect will be the effect desired. It is a universal law of nature that unless you have something to act upon which resists, you cannot act at all; not even the force of gravitation could attract any body unless every body resisted. Although you may throw a small piece of wood with all the power of your arm, you will not throw it very far nor strike anything with very great force; the power will be dissipated and you will have a feeling of "going to pieces." But if you throw a stone or piece of lead, whose weight is adapted to the power of your arm, you will throw much further and strike the target with very much greater force. When the weight and size of the stone is exactly adapted to the full power of your arm, the greatest effect will be produced, for that will be the relation of "right measure" between the stone and the full power of your arm for the purpose intended. In the moral realm the right amount of resistance is called self-control—the essential factor in temperance. Self-control, however, must not be confounded with self-repression, which results in nothingness and death.

Mr. Bryan, Stone and La Follette.

What is true with regard to the power of action as dependent on the right amount as well as the right kind of resistance in nature and in the moral realm, is not less true of social organizations, of governments and of nations. From the outbreak of the war in Europe, certain Americans, re-enforced by a considerable following of citizens of German and non-German descent, were active to maintain America in a condition of neutrality and peace. Pre-eminent among these men were Mr. Bryan and Senators Stone and La Follette. The resisting and "holding back" power exercised and led by these men not only steadied and clarified America's judgment, but actually **helped to strengthen and solidify the sentiment of the majority** for war on the side of the Entente. Without this controlling resistance which helped to make America emotionally and spiritually more temperate in dealing with the great crisis, this sentiment might merely have flared up and died down again. It is needless to say that men who will thus risk popular disapproval in order to speak their consciences must exert a powerful influence even in producing and moulding an effect which apparently runs counter to their efforts, for the strongest men are those who can exercise **the supreme self-control** whether for themselves or for the nation.

But although Mr. Bryan deserves to be mentioned as one of the leading influences for moderation and restraint in the great crisis, he is, unlike the two senators mentioned, apt to ally himself to impractical methods. Mr. Stone and Mr. La Follette are by no means pacifists at any price, but Mr. Bryan hopes to solve great problems and deal with critical conditions simply by negating them, but mere negation has never yet settled anything in this world. While we heartily agree with Mr. Bryan that peace and temperance are two of the greatest ideals of America and the world, we disagree altogether with him as to the methods by which to realize these ideals, as well as to the nature of real peace and true temperance. He hopes to maintain universal peace by denying the necessity of fighting for it, and he hopes to attain the greatest possible temperance by denying the existence of a legitimate natural want and by failing to inquire diligently as to what constitutes real temperance. He is wrong, absolutely wrong, on both propositions: if we would secure peace for ourselves and the world we must fight for it whenever it is necessary, and if we would promote true temperance we must fight intemperance in the very heart of man, and recognize the actual conditions in the lives of men in the broadest and deepest sense, and deal with them in the light of reason and experience. This is the only way in which the masculine and practical mind deals with actual problems and conditions, and it is futile to lift ourselves above such problems and conditions, either by beautiful generalizations or by impractical legislation.

Pacifism and prohibition consistently go together, but they do not embody in themselves two great ideals; they are only two wrong ways to incarnate those ideals in the lives of men. If we honor the men who strive for these ideals, this is all the more reason why we should be on our guard and oppose fallacious and false methods.

To the statement made in a previous chapter that all drinking nations are strong, while the abstaining nations are decadent, we may add here that the strong and advancing nations will also show all those other forms of intemperance which are due to the robust passions and elemental energies, for the absence of all overflow of such energies would certainly indicate that they are at a low ebb. The knowledge of this truth, as applied to the individual, has long been crystallized in

the saying that the man who is so very, very good and without vices great or small is really good for nothing. Self-control itself is derived from those finer and nobler passions which check the elemental passions and guide them to greater achievements, those finer passions acting as a rider who controls the horse, the elemental passions without which the higher passions could not come into active being. In weak individuals and decadent races the elemental passions are too feeble to produce the higher and controlling passions, so that they will often occasion the most disgusting manifestations of intemperance as a result of the feebleness of the very passions which it is supposed necessary to suppress. It is the case of a decrepit jade, which when not drowsing from sheer weakness and obtuseness, will perform all kinds of antics and which either needs no control or cannot be controlled, but only stopped; for control (the vital element in temperance) does not mean to stop or to suppress, but to obtain the best and most desirable effects from the thing controlled. Specifically applied to intemperance from drinking, this means that, as a rule, weaklings will be afflicted with this vice, because their power for enjoyment is greatly diminished to begin with and because they are drunkards per se, vainly chasing to get from without what is apparently denied them from within and fluctuating wildly from one kind of intemperance to another.

Hitherto we have only been trying to suppress that kind of drunkenness which strikes the eye most readily and disagreeably, not caring whether by our foolish and superficial reforms other and more dangerous forms of intemperance may not be roused into being. We have only been trying to force the social boil back into the organism without taking measures to prevent the poison from working greater havoc in the vital organs within; we were satisfied with the thought of getting it away and out of sight where it would not offend our physical eye; we were thinking really only of ourselves, not of promoting genuine social welfare. If we would truly reform social conditions, we must begin by working from the bottom up, not by blowing away some of the most conspicuous scum on the surface.

X.

ARE THE PROHIBITIONISTS THE WORST ENEMIES OF TRUE TEMPERANCE?

If prohibition, absolute, indiscriminate and universal prohibition were the best method or at least one of the best methods, by means of which true temperance could be secured as far as humanly possible in our country, we should, we repeat, certainly support it earnestly and consistently and with all our heart, but as not only common sense and reason, the moral law, as well as a mass of statistical evidence gathered through many years abundantly demonstrate that absolute prohibition is fundamentally inimical to true temperance, and the zealous prohibitionist has proved himself one of the most potent influences in fostering the more insidious and more dangerous forms of intemperance, we are with equal determination and earnestness opposed to this false principle.

It seems, indeed, that the contempt with which the professional prohibitionists, who would force total abstinence upon their neighbors, apparently treat the example of the founder of our religion, and the unscrupulousness with which they seem to be misusing statistical figures are only paralleled by their obvious ignorance of the problem they attempt to "solve" and their ignorance of the men whom they would thus forcibly restrict and among whom there are a **few drunkards and**

very many temperate drinkers. For these reasons it is not really so surprising that they have proved themselves in the end the worst enemies of that very temperance for the realization of which they are apparently working so zealously. Yes, I can point my finger at them as a man who is deeply devoted to true temperance and repeat without hesitation: "You are the very worst enemies of true temperance." Not even the disorderly and illicit liquor dealers are so inimical to the development and growth of true temperance as the professional prohibitionists. For the disorderly dealer is easily discerned as what he is, while the professional prohibitionist is disguised as the friend and advocate of temperance (disguised even to himself!) and for that reason really more dangerous, and it is he who attacks, with his impractical and foolish legislation and his disregard and perversion of moral values, true temperance at the very roots.

The Prohibitionist and the Disorderly and Illicit Dealer Work Hand in Hand for Intemperance.

One of the most remarkable phenomena in connection with the drink problem and temperance movement is that the professional prohibitionists and the liquor dealers (more especially the disorderly and illicit liquor dealers) co-operate in promoting and encouraging intemperance, not knowingly perhaps, but actually and in effect. This seems an astonishing paradox at the first glance, but it is nevertheless a fact which it is not difficult to demonstrate.

1. The prohibitionist is largely responsible for that species of criminals which is designated collectively as "bootlegger," and he prevents moderate drinkers from obtaining good, pure and light alcoholic beverages and forces them to use the strong, raw, ardent spirits which are always so much easier to obtain under prohibition than the lighter and better beverages, and which create that unhealthy craving that is so conducive to intemperance. The disorderly and illicit dealer encourages "bootlegging," (if he is not himself in that category) and prefers to sell his customers the superlatively strong distilled liquors, because it is much easier to handle that kind and because it is more profitable to sell it.

2. The professional prohibitionist exercises an undue influence upon politicians, legislators and even judges, often employing for that purpose methods which are immoral if not illegal, such as intimidation, blacklisting, misrepresentation, etc. The liquor dealers do the same thing more or less in retaliation, thus in effect again co-operating with the prohibitionists towards the same end, namely, disseminating corruption and promoting intemperance.

3. The professional prohibitionist repudiates the principles of his religious creed, not openly, but by indirection and often hypocritically. The disorderly and illicit dealer likewise ignores the maxims of religion and the principles of morality, only he does it more openly.

4. The professional prohibitionist preaches prohibition because it is his trade, because it is highly profitable to him, so that he often becomes a prey to the corruptnig power of money. **He makes money easily and plentifully because the liquor traffic exists.** The liquor dealer also often becomes corrupt because his trade is profitable and because he thinks he must fight for self-preservation, and he also **makes his money as a result of that kind of liquor traffic which the prohibitionist has helped to create.**

We will submit just a few concrete examples to illustrate how the professional prohibitionist and the liquor dealer, especially the illicit and disorderly dealer, work hand in hand to the same end.

When the prohibitory law was re-submitted to the vote of the people of Maine a few years ago and the law was re-affirmed only by a very small margin of votes, the illicit dealers had co-operated vigorously with the prohibitionists. The professional prohibitionists were evidently afraid in their hearts that the license law might be re-established and that they would have less intemperance to preach about, while the illicit dealers feared they would lose a great deal of profitable business, because people drink less, because they would be compelled to furnish a better quality of liquor and because the license they would have to pay regularly would exceed the fines they were paying.

A coalition of prohibitionists and liquor dealers likewise defeated an attempt by the legislature of Massachusetts some years ago to experiment in the so-called company system which has worked so successfully for real temperance in Scandivania. You see, both sides were again, consciously or subconsciously, afraid that the experiment might promote temperance unduly and thus militate against fat salaries, commissions and profits.

Mr. W. S., a minister, writes:

"In the city in which I live the superintendent and attorney for this so-called temperance organization spend their time largely in starting action against people who are supposed to be disregarding some of these many (prohibitory) laws. Frequently they employ men as 'spotters' who are willing to pick up a few dollars at the rate of $2.00 for each case they can discover, or at $15.00 per week for catching as many as they can. Then the law allows these attorneys and superintendents for each of these cases a fee. The lowest fee that I have heard of is $25.00. It is reported on apparently good authority that the fees are as high as $100.00 in some states. Throughout the year these cases are coming singly or in groups of ten or twenty or more.

"With the leverage of these foolish and iniquitous laws all sorts of cases may be started with no further purpose than that of settling them out of court on the payment of such fees as may be agreed upon. Thus we have built up a condition in which a small army of spies and attorneys and superintendents may fasten themselves like leeches upon the public, may domineer over state legislatures and police departments, and even, though despised by all intelligent and right thinking citizens, may make a better living than they have heretofore been able to make at any other occupation. It is the same condition described by Abraham Lincoln as 'the preacher who advocates temperance because he is a fanatic, and desires a union of the church and the state; the lawyer from his pride and the vanity of hearing himself speak; and the **hired agent for his salary.**'"

Are not these methods all paralleled by the "bootleggers" and disorderly and illicit dealers? Do they not also pick up a few dollars wherever they can—in alleys and in secret places? Do they not also fasten themselves like leeches especially upon the weaker men and boys? And are they not also making a better living at this iniquitous occupation than they could possibly make at anything else? Indeed, the parallel is deadly.

Nor must it be supposed that in the matter of wielding undue influence upon legislatures and the officers of the law and in the obnoxiousness and immorality of the methods employed to that end the liquor dealers "have anything on" the professional prohibitionists, the only difference being that the prohibitionists use political coercion **in the name of morality**, while the saloons do it without such pretense. For instance, according to the explicit and solemn declaration of W. H. Anderson, Anti-Saloon League superintendent of New York, every member of congress who will not vote for the submission of an amendment for national prohibition to the state legislatures thereby **"becomes**

an avowed exponent and protector of the liquor traffic." Do you perceive the Macchiavellian hand of intimidation? Any member of congress who will not vote with the prohibitionists is thereby branded as "an exponent and protector of the liquor traffic," just as, as we have elsewhere remarked, a man who merely drinks is by certain mechanical church members no longer considered a Christian!

Many instances could be cited proving that especially in southern states prohibitionists make an open practice of intimidating courts, in some cases going even so far as to arrogate altogether the functions of the court.

By means of the "ouster act," which prohibitionists were instrumental in foisting upon the state of Tennessee, and which provides that any public official can be removed from office **on the petition of ten citizens,** a handful of prohibitionists were able a few years ago to remove from office the mayor of Memphis, and a new mayor was appointed who was not elected by the people. The people, however, re-elected the ousted mayor for a term beginning in 1916, whereupon the same handful of men by the aid of the courts again removed the man who had been twice elected by the people and the office is now administered by a court-appointed mayor! Isn't this the acme of democracy and popular government?

Speaking of popular government with regard to the proposed amendment for national prohibition into voting for which prohibitionists have been trying to coerce our senators and representatives, do you know that should the legislatures of the various states vote on this amendment, whose purpose is not regulative in the sense that mail and railroad legislation is, but which aims to restrict men in their purely personal affairs, the smallest state shall have the same voting power as the largest, t. i., most populous, so that, for instance, the vote of one man in Nevada will be equal to the vote of one hundred and ten men in New York? Thus three men living in the states of Arizona, Idaho and Nevada, respectively, will have three votes, while forty-four men in New York will have only one vote; or three men, one living in each of the three states named, who would vote dry would outvote forty-four wet New Yorkers in the ratio of three to one.

As long as the places in which beer and liquor is dispensed are licensed and under strict and easy supervision of the law, there is hope that the traffic may be effectively controlled and regulated and that the interests of true temperance may be protected and served, but when the traffic (and drinking itself) is driven by prohibitionists into hidden and secret places, it eludes the law to such an extent as not only to defeat its purpose, but scatter the seeds of an intensified and far more vicious intemperance. The license is the bogey of both the illicit dealer and the prohibitionist, for it threatens and endangers, as much as anything else that has been tried, their business and existence.

Self-Righteousness Worse Than Physical Intemperance.

The professional prohibitionist seems to be utterly unable to realize that there is something far more obnoxious to God and man than mere physical excess, and that is self-righteousness (spiritual intemperance) and the presumptuous desire to regulate our neighbors' lives by some pet formula or law of our own which happens to suit ourselves. Christ says: "Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? for your heavenly Father knoweth that you have need of these things. **But seek ye first the kingdom of**

God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." But what the prohibitionist appears to say is this: **Seek ye first to avoid drink, and the kingdom of God will be added unto you;** or perhaps their fundamental principle is more correctly stated thus: **Let us first utterly abolish the drink traffic, and the kingdom of God will be immediately realized.**

There Is Poison in the Heart of Every Lie.

One of the worst results of the misrepresentations into which professional prohibitionists are led by their blind zeal and prejudice is their influence upon the mind of the child in its formative stages. Nearly all text-books on hygiene and physiology are filled with these perversions and gratuitous assumptions, just sufficiently interlined with facts to make them the more misleading, concerning the use of alcohol. I am quite willing to grant that their intentions are good, but here as elsewhere, when ends are attained by unscrupulous means, the final effect upon the character is either insignificant or disastrous; here as elsewhere it remains true that **there is poison at the heart of every lie,** especially at the heart of the disguised and hidden lie, and this poison is morally far worse than any poison that can be taken into the stomach. Why paint distorted pictures to the children? Why not take them fully into your confidence? The effect of this moral poison can be observed every day in the behavior, for instance, of many criminals who so often, if not invariably, put the responsibility for their crimes, not in any way on themselves, but wholly on an external circumstance—the opportunity of getting whiskey, so that whiskey has become the guise and cloak behind which so many defectives hide their weakness and turpitude and at the same time obtain sympathy from the gullible.

One of the most thorough and practically most competent English writers on temperance says: "The very name 'temperance' has long been a by-word among the educated and uneducated alike by being usurped to cover a bigoted and self-righteous propaganda **from which everything temperate was eliminated.** * * * True temperance is a national cause, but total abstinence and prohibition never has been and never will be."

Our prohibitionists throw all the responsibility for intemperance on the outward temptation of a business institution, the "drink traffic," and thus minimize the responsibility of the drinkers; but anyone who keeps his eyes open and has any knowledge of human nature knows that men do not drink because the drinking business exists, but that the drinking business exists because men want to drink and, they want to drink because it gives them pleasure, because "wine makes glad the heart of man."

All experience shows that in drinking countries deficiency of regular opportunities is a still greater force of intemperance than excess of such opportunities, because it drives the people to create irregular opportunities for themselves. The people in a free country always will evade an irksome social law and make their own opportunities, which, as a rule, are more harmful than those which the law has taken away.

Man the Master of Drink, Not Drink the Master of Man.

Until our would-be reformers become really earnest and rid themselves of prejudice and hyprocrisy and realize the devotion of the people for beer and milder liquors, they will continue to prepare dis-

appointment for themselves and continue to be the worst foes of true temperance. In spite of all gratuitous assumptions, man must prove that he is the master of drink, not drink the master of man; but the mastership of drink is taken for granted when it is thought necessary that drink be put physically out of his reach. Who are you that would treat your neighbors as minors and as being forever incompetent to regulate the affairs of their own bodies?

Nothing can be more certain than that drunkenness is primarily and fundamentally in the drunkard and only secondarily and incidentally in the drink, but our would-be reformers are so befogged in their prejudices and pet theories that they do not see that **to minimize the responsibility of the vicious always encourages vice more than anything else could encourage it.** The drunkard is a very great nuisance, in many respects a greater nuisance than the professional criminal; but to say that he is not responsible for his condition or his misconduct is to declare that he is, and always has been, morally dead, while at the same time encouraging and justifying his conduct. The elimination of individual responsibility for vices and delinquencies, such as drunkenness naturally also implies the elimination of moral desert, so that, ultimately, man's character would be merely a result of mechanical laws and he would cease to be a moral agent.

Concerning State Wide Prohibition.

As to the external effects and conditions brought about by state wide prohibition, it is not the purpose of this little book to present long arrays of statistical figures. Besides, it has been done so often, and the information thus obtained is at best superficial. The reader is referred to the U. S. States Bureau of Statistics at Washington where he can obtain the best statistical information that is available, and to simplify matters he should ask for the statistics for the two states that have had prohibition longer than all others, namely, Kansas and Maine, and if he will analyze these statistics, especially those showing final results, and compare them with corresponding conditions in the adjacent states that have not had prohibition, he will find that prohibition has proved itself worse than a failure. We may only add that scarcely in any other controversy than that regarding the efficacy of prohibition have figures been juggled to such utter confusion. O. K. Swaze, county clerk at Topeka, Kas., summarizes the situation in a letter to the writer with these wrathful words: "Both of them (the prohibition people and the liquor men) are monumental liars, and cannot be trusted to get a truthful story, apparently."

Since, as we have said in Chapter IX, all forms of intemperance are runners from one common root, it follows with the inevitableness of a natural law that when an attempt is made to suppress one form of intemperance by wholly repressing the natural desire of which such intemperance is an excessive indulgence or excrescence, the repressed desire will spring out in other and frequently more dangerous forms of intemperance. Hence we find that in the states which have had prohibition for many years the attempt to repress the desire to drink altogether has stimulated reactively, the following principal forms of intemperance: (1) the most obvious reaction in the form of intensification, à la bootlegger, patent medicine, illicit manufacture, etc., of that form of intemperance which it was the purpose to suppress; (2) the widely disseminated moral reaction in the form of hyprocrisy with all its by-products and effects on the general character; (3) that form of intemperance which we have called the most obnoxious and

hateful of all, namely, the intemperance of the spirit. The man who, abstaining, thinks he is therefore better and cleaner than his neighbor who may drink moderately is not cleaner or better, but merely in a state of spiritual decay. It is said that cleanliness is next to godliness, and so it surely is, provided that godliness is behind the cleanliness; but cleanliness without godliness is the furthest of all things from godliness. It is the cleanliness of the immaculate pharisee, the cleanliness of the whited sepulcher, the cleanliness of death. It is this spiritual intemperance which our Lord attacked vehemently on all occasions, while he treated the purely physical forms of intemperance as comparatively insignificant. Yet this worst and most subtle reaction to the repressive effect of prohibition naturally escapes the scrutiny of the statistician entirely, while the more obvious reaction which we recognize everywhere in public and private life and which we feel in the very atmosphere, that moral disease called hypocrisy, is likewise too intangible to be appraised as a definite quantity, so that the statistician can only tell us of the least obnoxious reaction to the repressive power of prohibition, namely, intensified intemperance from drinking and all that results therefrom, but even this least obnoxious effect will be found bad enough.

Is It the Goal of Prohibitionism to Transform the Whole World Into a Gigantic Penitentiary?

Our professional prohibitionists must be regarded as a sect who while still very loudly maintaining that they are followers of Christ, have really detached themselves from him to serve their pet passion to muzzle the mouths of men against drinking what they choose to drink. They are, therefore, at heart, also the enemies of popular government, and undoubtedly after succeeding to muzzle people against drinking, smoking, etc., they will proceed to muzzle them against expressing themselves freely by suppressing the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press. A letter written by one of these would-be reformers to the New York Evening Press is illuminatively relevant:

"Speaking now in my personal capacity, and not as a member of the Anti-Saloon League, I will say that I regard the anti-liquor crusade as merely the beginning of a much larger movement—a movement that will have as its watchword "Efficiency of Government." If I had my way I would not only close up the saloons and the race tracks. I would close all tobacco shops, confectionery stores, delicatessen shops and other places where gastronomical devilties are purveyed—all low theaters and bathing beaches. I would forbid the sale of gambling devices, such as playing cards, dice, checkers and chess sets; I would forbid the holding of socialistic, anarchistic and atheistic meetings; I would abolish dancing; I would abolish the sale of coffee and tea, and I would forbid the making and sale of pastry, pie, cake and such like trash."

That will be the millenium toward which the prohibitionists are gravitating, when the world will be one huge penitentiary in which the prohibitionists will be the jailers and guards!

How Prohibitionists Might Mohammedanize Christianity Still Further.

The prohibitionists might go still further in the process of muzzling men, and **introducing other Mohammedan laws and doctrines into our Christian community**, they might quite consistently advocate that the faces of all women be carefully hidden from all men but their husbands in order to remove another universal temptation from men, since certainly all female seductiveness is concentered in the face; a temptation which is even much more powerful for the majority of men than liquor, and by which the weak man is led into much greater danger.

For beyond all controversy woman is man's greatest temptation (and perhaps for that very reason also the solution of life's riddle to him).

The manner in which the professional prohibitionists frown upon such entertainments as dancing and ballets (which they collectively designate the "low theater") points precisely in that direction, for these entertainments are condemned chiefly because they provide what they term a too free contact between men and women, either through physical proximity or through visual contact. As if the touch of the average woman could be defiling to a man! The mere insinuation that such is the case is an insult of the worst kind. Their deep veneration of Mohammed might consistently lead them still further, and joining hands with the Mormons, they might want to put other protective barriers around the poor, weak American man in the form of polygamy. If one wife cannot keep a man straight, perhaps several wives might be equal to the task? Many prohibitionists will be horrified at such an ultimation of their reform work, yet nothing is more logical, for **the worst enemies of true temperance** will in the end, if they persist successfully in their present course, become the **worst enemies of true morality.**

I do not mean to be understood that there are not quite a large number of honest and sincere men among the prohibitionists, men who devote themselves earnestly and even unselfishly to the reform which they hope to achieve by prohibition, but these men lack psychological insight and human historical knowledge. They are therefore entirely incompetent to accomplish the tasks they have set themselves, for if they were competent they would not be total prohibitionists and allow themselves to be working under the blight of an artificially stimulated movement. We all know that ignorance and incompetence will often work more harm, either in public or private life, than even gross dishonesty, for the dishonest but intelligent man will frequently work for the good, since many cases arise in which his own good is identical with that of others or in which it pays much better to be honest than otherwise, but the incompetent though honest man, if left to himself, will nearly always work disaster. So much for the sincere and honest prohibitionist: he must first educate and reform himself to be a true reformer.

XI.

GOD IN THE WAR.

God Thought It Necessary to Tempt Man in Order to Make Him to His Stature.

The profound truth that all moral worth can only arise from a reasonable freedom of choice finds one of the strongest expressions and most illuminating exemplifications in the story of the "Fall of man." If it had been God's desire that above all things man should not disobey Him and fall, He would not deliberately have put the object of temptation in his way, for it would have been easy for Him, surely, to keep the forbidden tree out of man's reach. He knew absolutely the mind and character of the man and the woman He created, and being omniscient, He not only knew that they would be tempted, but that they would break His command, not to eat of the forbidden fruit. God thus could have prevented man's so-called Fall, either by not putting the object of his temptation within such easy reach, or by giving him such a will as would infallibly have obeyed God's law; but God did not want to prevent it because He knew that only by being tempted and

"falling" could the final touch be put upon his masterwork, the touch which lifted man out of a beatific animalism into the dignity of a moral and self-conscious being. It was not only necessary, therefore, that man should be tempted, according to a logical interpretation of this story, but even that he should learn **that he could act contrary to the command of God,** for only in that way could he learn self-control, only in that way could be revealed to him that he had a **free will.** Our prohibitionists, if they had been on hand, would undoubtedly have counselled God to pass a law for the removal of the forbidden tree, for of course they would know the business of making man's soul better than the Almighty, even as they deem themselves so much wiser than Christ, His only begotten Son.

The story of the Fall of Man does not teach that we should in any way favor artificial temptations for the purpose of building up character—for that would indeed be worse than folly—but that such natural objects of temptation which, when properly and reasonably controlled, serve a good and innocent end or are part of a proper scheme of life, a scheme in which the natural desires are not ignored or overridden, are **the rocks upon which alone true character is built,** although the too weak vessel may be shattered upon them. The spirit of prohibition is that of mediaeval aloofness, which demands the removal of all natural temptation and which when carried out to its logical conclusion leads to the withering of the heart and decay of practical manhood. It is a creed which is based upon self-deceit, self-righteousness and spiritual pride, and therefore infested with a canker at the very roots.

Has God Forsaken the World?

The initial step of the magic and wonderful transformation and evolution of man's soul as revealed in the story of the Fall of the first parents has been repeated since the advent of man countless numbers of times and is being repeated to this day to enable man to find **freedom, truth, salvation, God.** Also in the terrible war which is now waging in Europe and in which apparently the greatest ingenuity of the mind of man and the most effective machineries of destruction are employed on a vast scale to destroy as many human lives as possible, thousands of them, millions of them, so that hell is realized on earth with a frightfulness that transcends the imagination of a Dante and puts to shame the pen of a Milton. The soul of man is filled with despair in contemplating this sublimely awful spectacle, and he asks himself in the spirit of Job: Where is God? Has He entirely forsaken this world? Has He withdrawn Himself altogether from the affairs of man? For surely He cannot have a part in this hellish slaughter. And why does He not stop it? Is He absolutely indifferent to the world?

God Has Unlimited Faith in Man.

No, God has not forsaken man! He is not indifferent to the fate of the world. He merely repeats and re-enacts on a grand scale what He first did in Eden in allowing the first parents to be tempted and fall. He has confidence in His children that in spite of the terrible misunderstanding now raging between them, they will in the end find each other, find the truth and Him, and that out of the hatred which now sheds oceans of blood the most glorious triumph and the fullest and vastest understanding will spring the world has ever seen. So He lets them fall again and again in order that they may rise to a stronger brotherhood and see the greater light from the depths of their despair.

The German is fighting not only for himself, but also for his

enemies, and the Allies are fighting for the Germans as well as for themselves. The Germans have already taught their enemies efficiency, orderliness, greater respect for governmental authority and the necessity of an apparently autocratic centralization of power; the Allies, perhaps led by our own country, are going to teach the Germans the need and the grandeur of that popular government which grows out of liberty—for the people, of the people and by the people. And the fiercest enemies shall yet become the strongest friends, and through all the blood that is inundating the countries of Europe shall triumphantly rise that greater love which loves even its enemies.

The End of Autocracy and Plutocracy?

The political autocracy of kaisers and kings and the autocracy of money, although they had no intention of doing so at first, are going to fight it out to a finish, each hoping to subjugate or destroy the other. Yet both will go down and both will be forced to release their hold upon the people or meet at least their worst defeat in history. Political autocracy looms up as the worst enemy of the people, but after all it stands out in the open where it can be seen and attacked if only sufficient power can be mustered, but the instinctively and invisibly organized autocracy of money is more elusive and the infinite ramifications of its masterful system rest not only heavy on the shoulders of all men, but penetrate even into the hearts of nearly all of us, rendering us all more or less willing or unwilling slaves. If this bloodiest of all wars lasts long enough, the autocracy of kaisers and kings is doomed, but if it lasts still longer, the mightier autocracy of money will receive a blow so staggering that perhaps it will never quite recover its former point of vantage. The people thus freed from the two greatest tyrannies will come into their own, and one great purpose of this war shall have been fulfilled.

Thus men are going to prove themselves God's children. Yes, in spite of all the fearful array of appearances to the contrary, God has faith in His children. He lets them know His law, but He absolutely refuses to take away from them the power and temptation to break it. They must learn to be good, forbearing and temperate from choice, through the alchemy of their own hearts. Men are often satisfied with "actors," but God wants them to **live** what they are, perhaps He even prefers those who live wrongly to those who act according to some law which they are afraid to break or which they find it merely gainful to respect.

How indeed could men and nations learn self-restraint, **the vital element in temperance,** if they had no opportunity to exercise such self-restraint, but were always restrained by some power outside of them, whether human or divine? How could they learn justice, if they were always forced to merely act justly? How could they learn liberty, if they had not some choice, in seeking that liberty, to commit even wrong and sin?

No, God has not forsaken the world and God is not a prohibitionist! Even in the face of the most indescribable savagery He still has faith in man and allows him freedom of action, while the prohibitionists will not even admit that he is fit to be entrusted with the care of his own physical person in such comparatively insignificant matters as the regulation of his appetite in drinking. God says with the most terrible insistence that man's will is **free, free,** but the prohibitionists and those who have not faith in man say that he is no better than a slave or minor and must be forever fettered or "protected." Hypocrisy is one of the most dangerous poisons that can infect our national character,

and if the great war shall deliver us of this vice, a great deal shall have been gained for our national health through this deliverance alone.

Our own country shall be reborn to a greater national life and unification by those bonds which are rooted in the hearts of men and sealed by their blood. The Civil War was the great self-conquest of our nation and its internal unification by which we proved our indivisible and unbreakable nationhood, but the present war will give birth to that greater America which, while first of all maintaining its own integrity, does not even as a nation live for itself alone, but is a member of the great family of the world's peoples, and participates in the hopes and struggles of all. No sacrifice is too great to bring about the birth of this greater America which at last realizes its full destiny. No wonder that the world rocks and trembles in the throes of this mighty deliverance.

If the recognition of the freedom of the will or moral autonomy is only possible by the actual exercise of that will in the face of natural temptation with which the human will must be confronted, as first revealed and exemplified through the temptation of the first parents in Eden, **the human-divine consummation of this self-realization of the unity of man with God was accomplished on the Cross.** As the story of the Fall, like the prayer "and lead us not into temptation" (which takes for granted that God will lead us into temptation) shows with unsurpassable directness that God does not care for the goodness of mere seeming or acting, that he is not a prohibitionist, so the crucifixion proves beyond all possible controversy that **God is not a pacifist.** For in the person of His well beloved only begotten Son He makes war upon all corruption and sin, and especially upon hypocrisy and merely outward goodness, even to the point of laying down His life on the cross and forcing others to kill Him.

The War a Vastly Extensified Crucifixion.

Like the Fall of Man so the Final Rise of Man on the cross has been repeated every day and every hour, and the crucifixion has been re-enacted in countless millions of hearts, for it was in the heart of Man that the crucifixion took place and takes place, not on any place called Golgatha. As the Fall in Eden taught man that his will was free, so the story of the Cross reveals that the finest and sweetest fruit of that freedom of the individual will is **to freely surrender that will for the higher will, to submerge the individual life in the higher life of the Nation, Humanity and God.** As the Story of the Fall can be read in a vastly enlarged frame in the great world war, so the divinely intensive sacrifice of the Cross can be seen projected in this titanic world-tearing conflict extensified on a scale vaster than ever before in the history of this world. Nations are crucifying themselves apparently for the purpose of destroying each other, but in reality to find the greater brotherhood. Although the great world war is a Fall of immeasurable depth in that one nation will attack another nation seeking to destroy it, it is also a crucifixion of immeasurable height and grandeur in that the members of each nation immolate themselves for their country, for their ideals, for humanity.

How great and how far-reaching will that love be which will rise from the ashes of the world fire! If humanity survives from the awful, almost superhuman test, it shall have proved itself once more divine, as the Prince of Peace proved Himself human on the Cross. It will be a love so much vaster, a peace so much deeper, a humanity so much sweeter that we shall say that it was well worth the immeasurable sacrifice. Then, when all the wounds are healed, even France and

Germany, the two traditional world-historic enemies, the central figures in the focus of the great conflict and the most splendid fighters of all, may yet embrace like bride and bridegroom and become the chief guardians of world peace. Do not say this is a poetic dream: the greatest things are the dearest and they demand the greatest sacrifices, and it is a precious privilege to lay down one's life for so great a cause.

Though Men Are Brave and Noble, Women Are Braver and Nobler Still.

But great and noble as is the sacrifice of the men who give their lives on the battlefield, it seems that after all they do only the mechanical fighting on the outside, and that the bravest and noblest fighting is done by the women at home who eat their own hearts' blood and die over and over again without making any claim to renown and glory. Men give merely their own lives, but women give the lives of those they love as well as their own and yet live in the deep shadow of this double death. The men, their great task done, may rest peacefully beneath the blood-drenched battlefield, but the women must live on with hearts entombed. They all wear the crown of thorns and they are all crucified these noble women of France, Germany, England and the other countries at war.

Yes, men are brave, but compared with the bravery of the women, the most manly valor seems but as poor and idle swagger, and it is the bravest men who know best how true this is. Nor let us forget that in all things, especially the things of the spirit and soul which alone count in the end, women are also more temperate than men, although the men will corrupt them and exclaim: "C'est la femme!" It is the woman, she gave me of the tree!

The Lesson of the Great War.

If the great world war will teach one lesson of surpassing significance and importance, it will be the lesson of self-control and temperance: temperance in the desire for riches, in teaching that abnormal wealth belongs in a much lesser degree to the individual, no matter how obtained, than moderate and limited possessions; temperance in ruling and dominating, in proving that unbridled love of power becomes its own undoing even with the most formidable economic and military machine the world has ever seen; temperance in the vain exaltation of the spirit, in demonstrating that no nation belongs wholly to itself, that humanity is greater than the greatest nation, that man is greater than a mere German, Frenchman, Englishman or American; temperance of emotion, in showing that in the solution of great problems and issues individual feelings must be discounted for the greater good; yea, even temperance in eating and drinking, insomuch as the scarcity of supplies has put a check upon gluttony and excessive drinking the like of which the world has not experienced for generations, so that not only the spirit but also the body of man is receiving a purgation and purification as perhaps never before in the memory of the living.

If the great war, besides yielding the exquisite fruit of a deeper understanding and a sweeter brotherhood between the nations of the world, shall teach the world this great lesson of self-control and temperance, shall it not have been worth all it cost?

XII.

CONSTRUCTIVE REFORM OF LIQUOR LEGISLATION.

From all that has been said in these pages, would it not be infinitely wiser for our prohibitionists if instead of seeking to remedy the

drink evil by that purely repressive legislation which is proving the mightiest ally of intemperance and maintaining for that purpose at great expense a powerful lobby at Washington (men who are paid big salaries for the purpose of influencing members of congress for their cause) they would study the actual conditions and the nature of the "problem" they mean to solve and the real effect, in every respect, of such legislation as has been tried in this and other countries in order to determine what laws actually promote temperance. There can be no more doubt that reasonable laws, tested by experience, have proved and will continue to prove successful and helpful in reducing intemperance and promoting true temperance as that unreasonable, purely theoretical legislation has proved a failure and will continue to prove a failure. The true criterion of the reformer's sincerity and intelligence is his willingness to subject his theory or principle to the test of scientifically analyzed experience and be guided by that decision. But our prohibitionists have refused to study the drink problem honestly and impartially even at long distance; they have refused to come down from their self-righteous á priori position, and they have persistently denounced all those as henchmen of the liquor interests who tried to be fair and who sought temperance for its own sake rather than the vindication of a disproved method which attempts to solve the problem by trying to abolish it. That seems easy to them, for it requires neither study nor knowledge, only talking and legislating ad infinitum.

According to the prohibitionists, for instance, all alcoholic beverages are equally harmful: raw 100 proof spirit or even plain alcohol is classed by them with beer, which only contains 3½ per cent, and wine which contains 10 to 12 per cent, and to them everything containing alcohol is just "booze," although there is, physiologically speaking, a tremendous difference between these beverages and the wine and beer drinking nations have always been remarkably temperate. This fact is recognized to such an extent in countries like Denmark that the tax from all beer of 2.25 per cent alcohol has been removed entirely, with the result that general sobriety has taken a phenomenal leap upward, although the consumption of beer has enormously increased in that country. Until recently Denmark was one of the drunkenest countries, although the total amount of alcohol, measured in gallons of pure alcohol, consumed per capita was scarcely half that of Italy, yet, in striking contrast to Denmark, Italy has always been one of the most temperate countries on the globe, the reason being that Italians always drank wine, while the Danes drank ardent spirits. In Denmark, you see, they legislate in the interest of true temperance and not to vindicate a theory which does not work in practice. Our own federal government commits an error in taxing all beverages containing more than ½ per cent alcohol, because such taxation obviously has no regard of the possible effect on the drink evil.

Again, if our prohibitionists wanted to show their zeal for temperance sincerely and scientifically, they would long have seen the imperfection and inadequacy of our license system in helping to promote temperance. But they are, of course, not really interested in licensing the drink traffic or in finding out whether it can be so modified so as to become an effective agent for temperance; they only want to suppress the drink traffic, and where they cannot do that, they want as high license as possible. Now the great defect of the license system is that a **uniform fee is exacted regardless of the amount of liquor sold,** so that every dealer has a special incentive to sell as much as possible or at least enough, by hook or crook, to pay for the license and make a

profit. But between an inadequate license system and prohibition, both of which breed intemperance, there is a third way which is based upon scientific observation. All licensing and taxing should be imposed with a view of lessening the drink evil, and to this consideration the desire for revenue should always yield.

The brewers, of course, are greatly to blame in exploiting this imperfect license system by advancing the license fee to many dealers and then forcing them to produce the money out of the trade somehow, whereby the business receives a special and undue incentive as a matter of self-preservation which has no regard whatever of temperance. The liquor dealers and saloon keepers themselves hardly ever give the matter of lessening the drink evil a thought, they only think of their profits as do the men in other businesses. The brewers and dealers are beginning to see the error of their ways, but the license system must be reformed before much improvement can be expected.

One of the most successful experiments in scientific liquor legislation for the purpose of promoting temperance in drinking is the so-called **Gothenburg or company system.** This system is now in force all over Sweden and the greater part of Norway, and even in Aberdeen, England, it has been given a very successful trial by Lord Grey. In this system all the profits from the business, beyond the interest on the investment, which goes to the shareholders of the company, are devoted to charitable and public uses, so that no one is interested unduly in increasing the sale of liquor. As a result of this system the liquor business has been absolutely divorced from politics and the sale of ardent spirits has been greatly reduced, and Sweden and Norway, formerly two of the drunkenest countries in the world, are progressing fast on the road to greater temperance. In this system, too, the traffic is absolutely controlled by law and the number of public houses reduced to the lowest safe limits. The company system also demonstrates among other things that drink-selling can be made respectable and surrounded by a wholesome atmosphere even in those countries which have been cursed by drunkenness.

As mentioned in a previous chapter, an attempt was made some few years ago by the legislature of Massachusetts to experiment with the company system, but the liquor dealers and the prohibitionists, fought like brothers to render the attempt abortive.

Of the many futile and unscientific experiments in liquor legislation that have been made in our country there is at least one which has yielded good fruit, namely, the principle of Local Option. It is one of the very few successful principles of that kind that have been originated in our country, and the readiness with which other countries have adopted this principle contrasts very strongly with our ineptitude to learn from them who far surpass us in constructive and scientific liquor legislation. This principle has even been improved by the foreigners insomuch as they do not allow the country districts to dominate the cities in which the sentiments and the needs of the people are widely different from the country, a domination which is at least a misapplication of the principle, if not, in some cases, a suicidal violation thereof, as it creates, in a modified way, an obnoxious condition similar to that which would ensue in a vote on national prohibition, when one man in Nevada practically outvotes more than a hundred New Yorkers.

Of course, the American saloon in its present form must go; but let us not forget that the saloon, as it now is, is largely what the prohibitionists have helped to make it. It is a long and interesting story; but if the prohibitionists had only worked half as zealously to improve it as they have worked to just annihilate it and suppress all

drinking—regardless of consequences, it would be an entirely different story, and the tavern of Colonial days would never have degenerated into our present day saloon.

A Federal Board to Solve the Liquor Problem.

In the light of the splendid success which has been achieved by scientific and constructive liquor legislation in other countries, there is absolutely no excuse why in our own country this important reform should be left to a small body of inexpert, unscientific, self-elected propagandists who live not only for but **by the advocacy of prohibition** and whose business it is to manufacture that very public sentiment which makes such advocacy so profitable to them and who cannot help being corrupted by the immense sums of money over which they have control.

If any real and fundamental reform of the liquor situation is to be hoped for, **the Federal Government must begin it.** To that end congress should create a **Federal Commission** or **Board** for the sole purpose to investigate the drink problem. This board should be empowered and instructed:

1. To revise the tax and license system with a view, primarily, of lessening the drink evil, and only secondarily with the object of producing revenue. Under the present system of taxing and licensing the selling of those beverages is encouraged which are least conducive to temperance.

2. The causes of intemperance, whether economical, physiological or due to improper legislation, should be thoroughly investigated by the most competent experts and scientists that can be procured.

3. The results of the most important liquor enactments in our country, including absolute prohibition, should be carefully studied and ascertained to determine to what extent they fulfilled or failed to fulfill their purpose to promote temperance, real temperance, not apparent temperance or mere police record temperance.

4. The results of constructive liquor legislation in other countries should be given due consideration to determine as to what extent those laws might be profitably employed in our country.

5. The board should act in an advisory, and where necessary, in a mandatory, capacity to suggest to the states legal enactments which will divorce the traffic from politics and the producer from the retailer and in every way tend to lessen the drink evil. All patched-up and make-shift legislation should be abolished.

The creation of such a board would be the initial step towards real liquor reform, the kind of reform that would, first and last, aim to increase temperance. It is needless to say that the two great enemies of temperance, the liquor dealers and the professional prohibitionists, will be up in arms to oppose such radical and genuine reform—reform that will go down to the root of the evil, since both of these factions, as such, will be put out of business unless they also reform themselves in time. We note, however, that in Norway, where beer of 2.25 per cent alcohol is exempt from any impost, even the prohibitionists have conceded the wisdom of this measure. Norwegiar prohibitionists must be a great deal more sensible and intelligent than their American confrères.

23222

END OF
TITLE